CONSTANTINOPLE, CANTERBURY AND ROME

WOODLOCK

CONSTANTINOPLE, CANTERBURY AND ROME

CONSTANTINOPLE CANTERBURY & ROME

A Criticism of Bishop Gore's Theory of

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

By the
REV. F. WOODLOCK, S.J., M.C.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BX
1765
.G58
W6
1923
58,426

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4
NEW YORK, TORONTO
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS
1923

All rights reserved

Imprimi potest si iis ad quos pertinet videbitur
WILLIAM BODKIN, S.J.
Praep. Prov. Angl.

Nihil obstat
F. THOMAS BERGH, O.S.B.
Censor Deputatus

Imprimatur
EDM. CAN. SURMONT
Vic. Gen.

WESTMONASTERII
die 29 *Januarii*, 1923

Made in Great Britain

PREFACE

THESE lectures were occasioned by an Advent series of Addresses on 'Catholicism and Roman Catholicism,' given by Bishop Gore in the Grosvenor Chapel, Mayfair, in December 1922, and reproduced *in extenso* in the *Church Times* of that month.

They are being published, as the lecturer hopes that individuals from among the very large audiences which heard them delivered in Farm Street Church on the Wednesday evenings of January 1923, may care to have them in print.

No attempt has been made to reduce the spoken word to a more literary form.

The lecturer publishes all the more willingly as he believes that the Church theory propounded, after mature thought, by Bishop Gore is the one that is held to-day and will for years to come be held by typical 'Anglo-Catholics.' There is no room for further development of the 'Branch theory' of the Church. Canterbury will never imitate Constantinople and Rome in calling herself the *whole* Church Catholic.

The lecturer therefore believes that what he has said here in reply to Bishop Gore, and in criticism of his theory of the Church, may be useful to others besides those who listened to him in Farm Street or those who heard or read Dr. Gore's addresses.

F. WOODLOCK, S.J.

FARM STREET CHURCH,
February 11, 1923.
Feast of Our Lady of Lourdes.

CONTENTS

LECTURE		PAGE
I.	A Dogmatic Christ founded a Dogmatic Church	1
II.	The Papal Supremacy and the Eastern Church	15
III.	The Creeds and Unity of Belief	31
IV.	Apostolic Succession and Anglican Orders	49
V.	Constantinople, Canterbury and Rome	67
Appendix		87
Index		88

CONSTANTINOPLE, CANTERBURY AND ROME

LECTURE I

A DOGMATIC CHRIST FOUNDED A DOGMATIC CHURCH

[*N.B.*—I, II, or III after a quotation signifies that the passage quoted is from Dr. Gore's first, second, or third lecture on 'Catholicism and Roman Catholicism.']

If it is asked why these lectures are being given, I reply that this rejoinder to Bishop Gore is forced upon us by the importance of the Bishop and by the prominence given to his attack upon the Catholic Church. The *Church Times*, which may be described as the organ of the Anglo-Catholic Party in the Church of England, speaks thus of the Bishop:

> Bishop Gore is unquestionably the leading figure in the Church of England to-day. He has disciples everywhere. In the country villages, in Cathedral Closes, in University Common Rooms, in business houses there are found the people who 'trust Gore,' who, before deciding their attitude on any question, wish to know what he says about it (November 18, 1921).

If Anglo-Catholics trust *any* of their bishops as a guide, it is surely Bishop Gore who now rules no diocese in their Church.

reason, not to criticise and reject, but to understand and assimilate what doctrinal authority proposes to him as God's truth.[1]

Dr. Gore's 'free-thought' has, to the scandal of many and to the delight of the pioneers of modernism, allowed him to use the word 'myth' to describe the early narratives of Genesis; the argument being that the Holy Spirit might communicate truth by means of a tale, as Plato did sometimes in his dialogues. He declares in his lectures that 'since it lost the support of the belief in the infallible book, the movement of Continental Protestantism has shown an extraordinary degree of instability and weakness' (III). Anglicanism, in some aspects, shows the same symptoms of decay. Dr. Gore's principles should make it logically impossible for him to condemn that exercise of private judgment which issued in the Cambridge Modernists' heretical pronouncements. He may, and does, disagree with their conclusions; he

[1] I shall not waste time by a discussion, for the thousandth time, of the Galileo case, though the Bishop thinks it worth while to dig up that history once more in the cause of anti-popery. I repeat here the words of Mr. Hilaire Belloc, 'Galileo is dead, and that is all I have to say about him!'—save to refer anyone who believes that the Galileo case disproves the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, to the article in the 'Catholic Encyclopædia' or 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' or to a pamphlet, by Rev. E. Hull, S.J., in the Catholic Truth Society publications on the subject. The same applies to the question of the 'persecution of heretics,' 'Consulantur auctores probati.'

Nor shall I deal elaborately with the quotation from Lord Acton concerning the history of the Vatican Council, which adorns the latter part of Bishop Gore's second sermon. I merely balance it with the same writer's famous letter to *The Times* in November 1874:

'Our Church stands and our Faith shall stand, not on the writing of men, but on the surer ground of an institution and guidance that are divine. Therefore I rest unshaken in the belief that nothing which the inmost depths of history shall disclose in time to come shall ever bring to Catholics cause of shame or fear. I should dishonour and betray the Church if I entertained a suspicion that the evidences of religion could be weakened or the authority of the Councils sapped by a knowledge of the facts with which I have been dealing, or of others which are not less grievous or less certain because they remain untold' (*vide* 'Life of Cardinal Vaughan,' vol. ii. p. 297).

cannot condemn the free-thought which produced them. When he bitterly attacks the Catholic Church, and accuses it on the vital matter of the inerrancy of Scripture of 'doing its utmost to mislead the conscience of Europe and set the scientific intellect against Christianity,' he is striking *pro domo suâ*, and his gratitude to writers 'often alien to the Christian creed' for restoring the real meaning of our Lord's Humanity, which Roman obscurantism has clouded, makes us wonder how far he shares the views of his modernist fellow Churchmen as to the ignorance of that Humanity concerning the future of the world. 'New factors have to be reckoned with, which the Founder of Christianity was never called upon to consider.' 'Neither (Scripture nor Church authority) contemplated the situation in which we are placed' (*Times*, November 20, 1922), says his brother bishop of Durham apropos of facilities for divorce. Did Christ know what would be the effect of His words when uttering the Petrine texts? we would ask Dr. Gore. Was Christ 'called upon to consider the future'? Did Scripture 'contemplate the situation in which we are placed to-day'? And can we say He uttered them with the knowledge that the whole structure of the Papacy, up to the Vatican Council and beyond, would be raised upon his words to Peter as its logical foundation? If He uttered them knowing all this, yet merely meaning what Dr. Gore finds in them, then Christ has led the Church astray!

Let us turn then, after these detached preliminaries, to the Bishop's idea of the Catholic Church founded by Christ. I sketch the picture in lines drawn from the very words of his lectures lately delivered. It is given as his matured thought, but it has hardly ripened since the year 1888, when he first published his attack on the Church in his 'Roman Claims.'

That book, like Littledale's 'Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome,' has been the occasion of many finding the truth and taking the step of joining that very Church which both books were written to disprove. Littledale had his crushing reply from Fr. Ryder; Dr. Gore was completely answered by the eminent patristic scholar, Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., to whom I am indebted for much that I shall say, and to whose book I refer any of my readers who find me unconvincing.

Here is Dr. Gore's theory of the Catholic Church:

The Church is a visible Society established as the divinely constituted home of the great salvation, held together not only by the inward spirit, but also by certain manifest institutions. (I.)

It is the visible, tangible body known to history, and there is no recognised membership of Christ save membership in His earthly body. (I.)

This Holy Catholic Church is the organ and vessel of the Spirit. (I.)

He tells us 'we must be careful in speaking of Our Lord as having founded the Church, for in fact the Church is older than the Incarnation. The Church of Christ is the true Israel, but it needed refounding. The authority of the Scribes and Pharisees and the priesthood passes to others, and those others are the twelve.' (I.)

'I am profoundly aware,' he says, 'that the Catholic Church has been no more faithful to its charge than the church which was the people of Israel alone, and that it has been at times not the instrument, but the antagonist of the Spirit.' (I.)

God will always be by His Spirit in the Church, but there is no security offered us that the Church authorities in the New Covenant may not go wrong like the Church authorities of the Old Covenant. . . . Again and again the evidence shows that it has done so. (II.)

In the following passage Dr. Gore defines the essentials for membership in the Catholic Church to be

the possession of Creeds, Sacraments, and Apostolic Succession. Let us hear his actual words :

For maintaining unity there were specially three links, the observance of which was of divine obligation. First there was the holding of the common faith, the Word of God, which in course of time was expressed in the Creeds, especially in what we call the Nicene Creed, and protected by certain decisions of General Councils, and for which the Court of reference was the New Testament interpreting the Old. In the early days, before the New Testament books were written or before they were formed into a Canon, the authority lay with the Old Testament and the 'Tradition' which was the substance of the Apostles' teaching.

Secondly, there were the Sacraments. . . .

The third link of connection in a scattered but continuous Society was the institution of the Apostolic Ministry in Communion, with which all members of the body must remain. . . . To be a member of the Church meant from the first to be in communion with its officers and in submission to their proper authority. (I.)

Elsewhere he says :

I feel bound to acknowledge that all baptised persons are as individuals members of the Church Catholic.[1]

But this is not enough, I must acknowledge the same reality of the fruits of the Spirit in the Society of Friends which ignores Baptism. (III.)

With regard to St. Peter and his successors in the Apostolic See, Dr. Gore declares that

it does not appear that any office or authority is given to him [Peter] which is not shared equally by all the

[1] The declaration of the Lambeth Conference with regard to Nonconformity, as one would expect, agrees in this : 'We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ which is His Body.' On the point of membership of the Church see Lecture V.

Apostles. If you read the New Testament as a whole you will see that the idea of any official authority being given to Peter over and above what was given to all the Apostles has no support at all. . . . St. Paul's account of Church Unity under Christ the Head seems to exclude the notion of a supreme headship on earth. . . . (II.)

Recognition of the Papacy, as the West knows it, was never born in the Eastern Church. Easterns, when hard pressed and needing the help of Rome, did from time to time seek to conciliate the Pope by the use of phrases such as would please him. That is the Eastern way we know. (II.)

In becoming separated from the Roman See in 1054, did the Eastern Church abandon anything concerning the authority of Peter as persisting in the Roman Church which had been at any period part of its Creed ? The answer is a decisive No. The Catholic Christianity of the Greeks acknowledged no such doctrine. (II.)

The Church exists primarily to bear its moral witness.

It must be predominantly ethical . . . proclaiming for dogmas only certain truths, central and few, welcoming free enquiry on the part of all. (III.)

There is something infallible in the Church—that is the Word of God on which it rests. (II.)

Our Lord, who is the supreme example of authority, showed Himself strangely adverse to the use of the merely dogmatic method. He plainly desired that every man should think for himself. . . . He seldom gave a plain answer, He mostly replied by asking another [question]. Mere submission to dogmatic authority is not the spirit He seems to encourage. The stress of His claim is always moral. The same is true of St. Paul. . . . So it was with the early Greek Church. The Roman stress upon absolute ecclesiastical authority, the strong distinction between the *Ecclesia docens* (the hierarchy) and the *Ecclesia discens* (the laity), which has only to receive and obey—a distinction against which the Orthodox Church of the East has always protested—strikes a new note which represents a very different kind of appeal and claim from that of the New Testament. (II.)

The divisions within the Church, though they are

sadly deep, do not go near the root. In the unseen world where Christ is and the blessed dead, and in the Spirit who works in every heart and every sacramental ordinance, the Church is one. (III.)

Yet he says elsewhere :

If anything is certain, it is certain that visible unity in the Church of His disciples was the will of Christ. If so, to a horrifying extent we have departed from His will. (III.)

This, then, is Dr. Gore's picture of the Catholic Church, and were it a true picture, Anglo-Catholics were secure of their Catholicity. It is my purpose to show in my lectures, point by point, that the picture is a gross caricature of the Living Body of Christ in which the Holy Spirit of Truth dwells. It gives the lie to Christ's promises. A Church thus divided upon earth, rent limb from limb by schism, tongue-tied, and unable to speak authoritatively in His name, is not the Church He founded upon Peter, and sent to teach the whole world, with the promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against Her, and that He Himself would be with Her all days to the very end of the world. It may be the imaginary Church of the Anglican Homily in which we are told :

'Laity and Clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages and degrees of men, women and children in the whole of Christendom [a horrible and most dreadful thing to think], have been at once drowned in damnable idolatry . . . by the space of more than 800 years.' Such a Church would still fit Dr. Gore's description, but such has not been the history of the Church of Christ.

One point only shall I take in this lecture for criticism. It is a fundamental one. When grasped, it explains the attitude of Rome throughout the ages. The denial of it is the fundamental error of

Protestantism. Let us examine whether it is Christ's will, whether, to use Dr. Gore's words, Christ '*plainly desired that every man should think for himself*.' Was He, as Dr. Gore asserts, '*strangely adverse to the dogmatic method*,' was '*mere submission to dogmatic authority*' a spirit to be discouraged? If so, the autocratic dogmatism of Rome lies subject to a stronger condemnation than that which it merits through being distasteful to Dr. Gore and those like him who boast of being 'free-thinkers in the best sense,' and who regard the acceptance of ecclesiastical authority in place of the best judgment of their own reason as an 'impossible treason against light.' If 'free thought' is a Christian inheritance for every man, then Rome's usurpation of dogmatic authority over the souls and consciences of men is a tyranny. That this usurped authority adds God's name to its commands, makes it a blasphemy that deserves all, and more than all, Dr. Gore has said against it.

Let us turn to the New Testament, and let us see what judgment our reason forces us to form about our Lord's wishes in regard to the authority of the Church.

But, first, what was St. Paul's attitude towards dogmatism? Does *he* desire 'each man to think for himself'? The Bishop properly asserts that St. Paul shared Christ's spirit. 'I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor did I hear it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ' (Gal. i. 12). 'Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard from me . . . keep the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Spirit who dwelleth in us,' he says to Bishop Timothy (2 Tim. i. 13, 14). 'Until we meet in the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God . . . that henceforth we may be no more

children tossed about by every wind of doctrine' (Eph. iv. 13). 'That we may know the things that are given us by God' (1 Cor. ii. 12). 'For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered to you' (1 Cor. xi. 2, 3). 'Keep my ordinances as delivered to you' (1 Cor. xi. 2). 'The truth of Christ is in me' (2 Cor. xi. 10). 'There are some that trouble you and would pervert the Gospel of Christ, but *though we* or *an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema*' (Gal. i. 7). 'As we have said before, so now I say again, if any one preach to you a Gospel besides that which you have received, *let him be anathema*' (*ib. v.* 9).

Are these the words of one who plainly wished 'every man to think for himself,' are they a panegyric of 'free-thought' in religion? Does St. Paul here show himself 'adverse to the dogmatic method' and mere submission to authority? He talks in the tone of a Roman Pope anathematising a Modernist!

And now with regard to Christ Himself. Of Him it is explicitly said that He taught, 'not as the Scribes and Pharisees'—not, I may say, as an Oxford Professor of Divinity or an Anglican Bishop—but 'as one having authority.' The authority of Moses' Law must give way before Him. 'I say to you.' That must suffice once they have learnt who He is. 'Not flesh and blood'—human reason—'but the Father in Heaven' revealed to Peter who the Master was, 'the Christ, the Son of the living God.' The Father sent Him with authority, and that same authority He communicates to His Church: 'As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you,' 'He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me.' Henceforth He will be sensitive to the way the Apostles' teaching is received, for their words are His. To despise them, to criticise, to refuse belief to their

message, in the name of private judgment, is to criticise and disbelieve Him. Again, like the anathema of a Roman Pope, which does but echo them, the terrible words are uttered, the sanction of His dogmatic law, '*they that believe not shall be condemned.*'

Yet Dr. Gore says Christ 'plainly wished each man to think for himself'!

Is it true, then, to quote Dr. Gore's words, that 'the Roman stress upon absolute ecclesiastical authority, the strong distinction between the *ecclesia docens* (the hierarchy) and the *ecclesia discens* (the laity), which has only to receive and obey, strikes a new note which represents a very different kind of appeal and claim from that of the New Testament'?

Of Himself He said, 'For this I was born, and for this I came into the world, to give testimony to the truth.' To His disciples He said '*All things* whatsoever I have heard from My Father I have made known to you.' 'The Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive,' is promised to them. 'He will teach you *all* things and bring to your minds *whatsoever* I shall have said to you.' He prayed to the Father, 'As Thou hast sent Me into the world, I also send them into the world.' 'Sanctify them in truth.' 'Not only for them do I pray, but for them also who through their words shall believe in Me. That they may be all one as Thou Father in Me and I in Thee, *that they may be one in us that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*' Their unity of belief was to be a proof of His mission.

So He sent them forth, strong in the power of these promises and in the gift of the abiding Spirit of Truth. 'Go ye into the whole world and teach all nations, teaching them to observe'—not, as Dr. Gore would have it, only '*certain truths, central and few*'—but '*all* the things *whatsoever* I have commanded you,' *i.e.* all the things 'whatsoever I have heard from the Father.'

What wonder that He adds the sanction of condemnation for disbelief in their teaching! And His last comforting words have sounded in the heart of the Catholic Church through its long and stormy history, 'Behold I am with you all days, yea, even to the very end of the world.' He will be with them in their teaching.

If the Church has a divine mission to teach (*ecclesia docens*) the whole world has a duty to be taught (*ecclesia discens*). *Docens* and *discens*, teacher and disciple, these words are correlatives. Surely this distinction is not a 'new note,' difficult to distinguish in the revelation of Christ's will given to us in the New Testament. If Dr. Gore is a Catholic Bishop he has a duty to teach; but the doctrine that he here propounds is the doctrine that his disciples must 'think for themselves.' It is a doctrine that dismisses and disbands his disciples.

What he says about the Greek Church always protesting against this distinction between the *ecclesia docens* and the *ecclesia discens* is utterly false on the face of history. The condemnation of heretics was the chief business of the early Councils, all of which were held in the East. If every heretic had been free to use his own judgment, and if the Greeks had recognised this right, Arius, Nestorius, and the others would have lived in peace in the Catholic Church, unmolested by the autocratic dogmatic authority which relentlessly excommunicated them. From the first the Catholic Church showed its *Christian* spirit by being as intolerant of error as it was insistent upon Christ's truth. This is a divine mark of its legitimacy.

To sum up. Dr. Gore asserts that Christ wished men to think for themselves. The New Testament declares clearly the very opposite. Christ was a dogmatist; He appointed dogmatic teachers to teach ALL His doctrines, and gave them the Holy Spirit to

call to their minds ALL the truths He had received from the Father and taught to them Himself. He promised to stand by them in their teaching.

In the world to-day there is one Church alone that teaches in this way, one alone that bears this likeness to that primitive band that went out into a pagan world to make it Christian. One teacher alone has Christ's voice of authority. The Church of Peter to-day is the only dogmatic teacher of truth. And Dr. Gore, claiming to be a Catholic Bishop, bitterly assails that Church, attacking her because she possesses this distinguishing mark that shows her to be the Body of Christ in which His Spirit of Truth dwells.

He attacks the Mark of her Divine Dogmatism.

He attacks her with a vehemence which might seem almost born of hatred. Despise her he cannot. God grant that he may be excused, learned though he be considered by his followers, for a blindness and ignorance that we should hesitate to call blameworthy in his case! May he never fall under the condemnation fulminated against those of whom Christ said, 'He that despiseth you despiseth Me.' May the plea of Christ prevail, 'Father, forgive him; he knows not what he does,' in this attack upon Christ's Body the Church!

LECTURE II

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY AND THE EASTERN CHURCH

'A wise man built his house upon a rock: and the rain fell and the floods came and they beat upon that house and it fell not, FOR IT WAS FOUNDED ON A ROCK.'—*Matt. vii.*

WE now strike into the very heart of the controversy between ourselves and Dr. Gore—the position of Peter and his successors, the Roman Popes, in Christ's scheme of Church government.

That Christ had *some* scheme of government for His Church must be admitted by all who admit that He founded a Church and intended it to last on earth as a visible Society to the end of the world.

Modernists would claim that Christ did not know the future; that He expected the end of the world to come almost at once; that, therefore, He never intended to found a Church, and that the Petrine texts must be interpolations and without any doctrinal validity.

But in controversy with Dr. Gore we need not deal with this 'apocalyptic,' heretical idea. Dr. Gore believes, as we do, that Christ intended to found a Church; that Christ knew the future, and that He must have made some provision for it. He wished His Church to last to the end of time.

It was to be a visible society, and a visible society is a unit. Europe is not a visible society, but a group

of nations, each of which is a unit, a society. Now Bishop Gore speaks of the Roman and Greek Churches, 'in spite of their variations and in spite of their having lost intercommunion, as being communions *within the area* of the one visible Church Catholic' (III). He invents and falls back on a mere geographical simile of juxtaposition. The similes used by Christ are inapplicable to the Church theory put forward by Anglicans as a means of including themselves in the Catholic Church, a theory which is repudiated by both Rome and Greece. Each of these declares herself to be the whole Church, and each denies to Anglicanism any share in Catholicity, save that remnant of Catholic truth which the Protestant Churches carried away with them into their schism at the time of the Reformation. Arians, Nestorians, Monophysites, all who were ever Christian, took with them *some* Catholic truth when banished from the Church.

To return to the geographical simile—'*the area of the Catholic Church.*' The Balkans are a geographical area; the units inhabiting it were notoriously far from living in political unity with each other. They could not be grouped and called 'one body,' 'a city upon a hill,' 'a vine,' 'one sheepfold,' 'one Church.' The League of Nations is only a 'league,' a confederation, if all the represented nations are 'in communion with each other.' If two of the big nations repudiate the claims of all the rest, and each declares that she alone is the whole league, the league ceases to exist in spite of the weak protest of a group of small nationalities that proclaim their right to declare the league still in being, and themselves members of it. The United States would not be the American nation, a unit, unless *united*. I emphasise this new metaphor of Bishop Gore's. It was necessary for him to frame it, for the metaphors of Christ exclude his Church from 'the body,' 'the sheepfold,' 'the

house built on a rock,' 'the city upon a hill,' because of the excommunication of the Church of England from the rest of Christendom.

The question of Peter and the Popes, then, is the one thing that counts in this controversy about the membership of the Catholic Church. Now what does Dr. Gore say about Peter? I quote at length from the passage where Peter first appears upon the scene in the Bishop's lectures. The italics throughout are mine.

Our Lord, who shows elsewhere His profound sense of the need of a *strong foundation* for the spiritual fabric, appears in this passage as determined *to find it in men and not in documents*. But He sees in men generally a shifting sand on which He cannot build. Now at last, as with a sigh of relief, He sees in Simon the son of Jona, in virtue of his confession of His Messiahship in trying circumstances, *one who is capable of being solidified* into rocklike consistency, something on which He can build. So He hails him: 'Thou art Peter (Rockman), and on this rock I will build my Church,' that is my Israel, the Israel of the long promised Messiah. And His Israel shall be, as the prophets always held, indestructible. 'And the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.' And He promises at some future date to constitute Peter *the* steward (or a steward) of the divine household . . . and He promises *to give to Peter the authority*, so familiar to the Jews, to bind and loose, that is to interpret the divine law by way of prohibition (binding) or allowing (loosing) with a heavenly sanction. This means a restricted legislative authority, restricted, I say, because it implies a divine law to be interpreted, and it is only as interpreters of the law that they must legislate; though in our Lord's case He laid down very few statutes, and left the Church which He had founded largely in the freedom of the Spirit to make its own necessary laws. (I.)

Later the Bishop asserts:

Our Lord is represented as *re-establishing* Peter in his pastoral office, that is, in the Old Testament sense, in

the *office of ruler* with the double duty of feeding and discipline.

These special dealings with Peter and promises to Peter are connected with our Lord's personal dealings with him ; and though he appears as leader of the Apostles, *it does not appear that any office or authority is given to him which is not shared equally with all the Apostles.* (I.)

If you read the New Testament as a whole you see that the idea of an *official authority being given to Peter over and above what was given to all the Apostles has no support at all.* (II.)

He is the leader of the apostolic band, but no more. (II.)

Here, then, we have Dr. Gore's private interpretation of the Petrine texts. Do they patiently and reasonably bear such a limited meaning ? Is it the meaning that the great Fathers of the Church, East and West, found in them ?

First note that if Dr. Gore's theory is correct, then Christ left no effective bond of union for His visible Society. Schism is an impossibility if there is no authoritative centre of government. A 'united episcopacy' cannot be proposed as a substitute, as that would cease to exist as soon as the twelve who were endowed with personal infallibility were dead, and the private judgment of individual bishops began to take the place of their authoritative teaching. An heretical minority would destroy the 'united episcopacy,' and the Church could never speak with a unanimous voice to condemn an heretical bishop. His dissent would be enough to destroy the unanimity which alone would secure an infallible judgment, in the absence of an Apostolic See endowed with the authority that was Peter's. If a 'united episcopacy' is the only security for doctrinal unity in the Church, then the doctrinal unity is gone for ever from the earth.

The New Testament Scriptures were only brought

into one book long after the death of the Apostles, and they had to be sifted from the many apocryphal writings, so they cannot be appealed to as the only infallible guide for the primitive Church. Infallible guidance was needed to know what was and what was not Scripture. As Dr. Gore admits, Christ is determined to find a strong foundation for His spiritual fabric '*in men, not in documents*.'

Peter's prominence is more than that of a mere spokesman. The indefectibility of the Church is linked with his personality in this promise. It is something very personal, distinguishing him from the rest of the Apostles who had failed to recognise the Messiah. 'Blessed art *thou*,' Christ cries, not 'Blessed are *ye*.' And again, He distinguishes Peter from the rest: 'Satan hath desired to sift *you* (plural) as wheat, but I have prayed for *thee*, and so do *thou*, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.' The thrice repeated commission is again no reinstitution of Peter in the Apostolate. He had never lost it. 'Feed My lambs, be a shepherd to My sheep, feed My lambs and sheep,' are words which put him as shepherd in charge of the whole sheepfold of the Good Shepherd. The word *ποίμαινε*,[1] 'be a shepherd to,' is the word that signifies clearly the office of ruling. The kings were the 'shepherds of the people'—their *rulers*.

Peter alone had his name changed to signify his personal office in the Church; Peter alone has the 'keys,' symbolising his supreme power to rule, to open and shut, and the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail is unmistakably linked to and made the result of his office in the Church. Peter alone is appointed as shepherd of the whole flock, lambs and sheep. The weighty words of Lord Halifax, spoken at the meeting of the E.C.U. on the occasion of the

[1] Septuagint, *ποιμανεῖς*,=='Thou shalt *rule them* with a rod of iron.'—Ps. ii. 9.

Sheffield Church Congress of 1922, do not express Dr. Gore's view. Lord Halifax said: 'Can anyone read our Lord's separate charges to Peter, if controversy is put on one side, and regard paid to the general tradition of Christendom, without feeling that the natural inference to be drawn from them is that some special duty in regard to the whole Church was conferred on him?' (*Church Times*, October 6, 1922).

I shall not spend time in quoting from the Latin Fathers of the Church their absolutely clear recognition of Peter as the first Pope of Rome, with those powers enumerated and admitted which repel Dr. Gore to-day, for the Bishop has chiefly devoted himself to alleging that these claims were never admitted in the East, and hence were never the teaching of the undivided Church of Christ.

The East never acknowledged the Roman Claims to a divinely granted supremacy. (II.) 'Recognition of the Papacy, as the West knew it, was never born in the Eastern Church' . . . (only) 'an honorary precedency which they ascribe to its position in the capital see of the Empire.' (II.) At the schism of 1054 the Eastern Church did not abandon anything concerning the authority of Peter as persisting in the Roman Church which had at any period been part of its creed. (II.)

Dr. Fortescue, no mean authority on matters concerning the Eastern Churches, thus summarises his chapter on the Papacy and the East:

The Eastern Churches acknowledged the primacy during the first eight centuries. The great Greek Fathers believed that Peter was the foundation of the Church, the chief of the Apostles, that he always lives and reigns in his successors the Bishops of Rome, that therefore the Roman See is the foundation of all sees, that their bishops are bishops of all bishops. This same conclusion lasted through the Byzantine period (since Justinian) till the schism. The Eastern Churches acknowledged the Pope as

the highest judge and his see as the last court of appeal in their affairs too: their bishops constantly used their rights of appealing to Rome. The Pope's primacy is confirmed by all the Councils that the Catholics and Orthodox agree in considering Œcumenical, except the two which were irregular in everything but papal confirmation. ('The Orthodox and Eastern Church,' p. 97.)

St. John Chrysostom, one of the greatest of the Greek Fathers, is surely a witness to the belief of the East. That eminent scholar, Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., says: 'I have collected all the evidence in St. John Chrysostom's writings with regard to St. Peter. The quantity is enormous, and the result of the examination is not ambiguous' ('Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims,' p. 58). Commenting on the passage, 'He said to him, Feed My sheep,' St. John Chrysostom says: 'Why does he pass over the others and speak of the sheep to Peter? He was the chosen one of the Apostles, the mouth of the Apostles, the head of the choir. . . . If anyone would say, "Why then was it James who received the See of Jerusalem?" I should reply that *he made Peter the teacher not of that See but of the world*' (Hom. 88 in Joan.). Again, 'God allowed him to fall because He meant to make him *ruler over the whole world*, and that, remembering his fall, he might forgive those who should slip in future' (Hom. quod. freq. 5). St. John mentions that St. Peter might have appointed a new Apostle in the place of Judas by his own authority. This surely is an extreme exercise of authority in the primitive Church. 'Could not Peter himself have chosen the individual (Matthias)? By all means, but he abstains lest he should appear to indulge partiality. He is the first to proceed in the affair *because all have been delivered into his hands*; for to him Christ said "Confirm thy brethren, being once converted"' (Hom. III. In I cap. Act.).

The rock foundation attributed to Peter by East and West cannot be removed when the building is complete. It is not a scaffolding. The greater is the need, the larger the Church becomes. Hence Peter's office is recognised as having passed to the holders of his See, and they have their authority because they occupy that 'Apostolic See.'

The Erastian Bishops of the East who pleaded for the advancement of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, because it was 'a New Rome' now that it had become the seat of the Emperor of the East, call Leo's See 'most holy and apostolic.' Not because of the greatness of Imperial Rome, but because it was the see of Peter, the Apostolic See, the city where the bodies of the Apostles lie buried, is Rome of ecclesiastical importance. The 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon,[1] made so much of by Bishop Gore, refers only to patriarchates, not to the primacy; it was not Œcumenical, it was rejected by the Pope and expunged from the codices of the Oriental Church. It was passed, not by the whole Council, but by a fraction

[1] 'St. Methodius (born 826), the Apostle of the Slavs, though a Byzantine by birth, inspired one of his disciples to write, or more probably wrote himself, in the Slav tongue a digest of ecclesiastical law, called the Nomocanon. In his annotations he protests vigorously against the fictitious 28th Canon of Chalcedon.

'It is to be noted that this Canon (28) was not approved by Blessed Pope Leo. Nor is it true, as the Canon maintains, that the Fathers of the Church granted the primacy and the seat of honour to ancient Rome because it was the capital of the Empire. On the contrary, it was from on high that it originated; from grace divine that this primacy is derived. . . . The dignity of presiding over the sacerdotal hierarchy is not the gift of the civil power, it is the result of divine choice and apostolic authority. . . . Because he is put above all the churches, the Roman Pontiff has no need to betake himself to Œcumenical Councils for what he would propose to the Churches. Nay *without his participation, manifested by the sending of his legates, Œcumenical Councils are as if they were not. It is he who gives legal value to what has been decided on in a council*' (Prof. Pavlov, 'Vizantiiskii Vremennik,' vol. iv. pp. 150–152, and quoted by Fr. d'Herbigny in *Irish Eccles. Record*, November 1922, p. 520. Professor Pavlov is an Orthodox theologian and historian).

who remained after the departure of many of the bishops.

After the dogmatic letter of Pope Leo had been read before the assembled Fathers of Chalcedon, they accepted its teaching. '*Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo*,' was their cry (Hardouin, ii. 306).

The most erudite of modern Orthodox historians who have written on the ancient Greek Church, M. N. V. Bolotov, acknowledges that 'in the teaching of Leo on the question of jurisdiction, all Roman prerogatives are found even as they are defined in the Vatican Council'[1] (see d'Herbigny, 'Theol. de Ecc.,' ii. p. 139).

These, then, are the words of the Fathers of the largest of the first seven Œcumenical Councils held in the Eastern Church, to the Pope who presided by his legates at their deliberations. Yet Dr. Gore says: 'The East *never* acknowledged the Roman Claims to a divinely granted supremacy.'

The East continually appealed to Rome to have its disputes settled, and this, not as to a voluntarily selected arbitrator, but as to one who has authority to settle such points from his official position as successor of St. Peter. Let us hear how Dr. Gore disposes of such appeals. He cannot deny their existence.

> Easterns, when hard pressed and needing the help of Rome, did from time to time seek to conciliate the Pope by the use of phrases such as would please him. That is the Eastern way we know. (II.)

I wonder, in passing, whether the recent admission of Anglican Orders by the 'hard pressed' Patriarch

[1] Bolotov says apropos of the letter of Gelasius I to the Easterns: 'in virtue of the primacy of Peter, the Bishop of Rome confirmed the decisions of Councils, more often decided matters without reference to councils; appeals from all over the world were addressed to him, yet there was no room for an appeal from the Bishop of Rome.' 'This letter of Gelasius was evidently not well understood in the East, *for it did not meet with any formal protest*' (d'Herbigny, 'Theol.' ii. p. 149).

of Constantinople, 'needing the help' of the British Empire, is regarded by Bishop Gore as another illustration of 'the Eastern way' of using 'phrases calculated to please,' but insincere!

Now look at one of these cases of appeal, the one quoted from Duchesne by Bishop Gore. Theodoret tells the facts about St. Athanasius and the appeal to Rome. An Arian Synod at Antioch in 340 professed to depose Athanasius and to set up a rival Bishop, Gregory of Cappadocia, as Bishop of Alexandria. In Theodoret's words, 'But Athanasius, already knowing their wiles, went away to western parts. For the Eusebians (Arians), having got together calumnies against Athanasius, had denounced him to Bishop Julius, who at that time administered the Roman Church (337–352). Julius, *following the law of the Church, ordered them to come to Rome*, and summoned also Athanasius to explain his case. But they who had made up this fable would not come to Rome, for they knew that their lie would be found out.' The Pope declared Athanasius innocent, and wrote a stern letter to the Eusebians: 'Do you not know that this is the custom that you should first write to us that *what is right should be settled here*?' This letter St. Athanasius quotes in his 'Apologia contra Arianos.' Only the heretics refuse to admit the Pope's right to intervene or refuse to accept his decision. In reference to this subject St. Basil writes to St. Athanasius: 'We have thought it expedient to write to the Bishop of Rome that he should examine our affairs, and advise him, since it would be difficult to send anyone thence' (as legate), 'by the common decree of a Synod *to use himself his lawful authority* in the matter, choosing men . . . *fit to correct all perverse people in our parts* gently and firmly ('Ep. ad Athan.').

To go back to still earlier times, when Byzantium was a little town probably without a bishop, St.

Irenaeus wrote his book against the Gnostics, and advances the tradition of the great Churches beginning with Smyrna. But 'it would be too long,' he says, 'to enumerate all the Churches; it suffices to point to one, the greatest and the most ancient.' 'The superior pre-eminence of that Church is such that every Church, I mean the faithful of any country whatever, necessarily agrees with her' ('Iren. adv. Haeret.' iii. 3).

Of this passage Duchesne says: 'It would be difficult to meet with a clearer assertion (1) of the unity of doctrine in the universal Church, (2) of the sole sovereign importance of the Church of Rome as witness, guardian and organ of apostolic tradition, and (3) of her superior pre-eminence over the whole of Christianity' ('Separated Churches,' p. 80). No *political* pre-eminence could guarantee in this way the orthodoxy of the Roman Church, or its right to pre-eminence in ecclesiastical matters.

The 'first step towards Papal domination,' as Bishop Lightfoot calls it, had already left its record in history before the end of the first century, for Pope Clement of Rome had written an 'urgent and imperious letter,' 'peremptory in the authoritative tone it assumes,' to the Corinthian Church, which was agitated by serious internal disorders. It was a spontaneous exercise of his universal jurisdiction. These are the words the Bishop of Rome uses to a Grecian Church, even during the lifetime of the Apostle St. John: 'If any should *disobey* the things spoken by Him (God) through Us, let them know that they will involve themselves in no light transgression and danger' (Ad Cor. lix. 1).

How was this letter received? It was received with submission, and was treated almost with the reverence due to Holy Scripture. Seventy years later it was still being read in the assemblies on

Sundays. The writing of the letter proves Pope Clement's consciousness of his supremacy; the docile reception of his letter proves that his supremacy was recognised at Corinth before the year 100.

In A.D. 190 Pope Victor convened all the Councils, even those in the East, and he excommunicated dissentients from his decision as to the date of Easter.

One of the Bishops of Patara writes, this time not to the Pope but to the Emperor Justinian, about Pope Silverius, whom the Emperor was persecuting: 'There are many sovereigns on earth, but not one who is *placed over the Church of the whole world as is the Pope*' (d'Herbigny, 'Theol.' ii.)

What wonder, then, that a Pope, Anastasius (A.D. 401), appealed to by the Bishop of Jerusalem, could reply: 'My care shall not be wanting to preserve the Gospel faith of my peoples, nor shall I fail to help by letter *all parts of my body that are spread over the world* as far as lies in my power' (Ep. i. ad Joan. Jer. n. 5). He felt that he was in reality, and was recognised by his members to be, the head of a living body, the visible Church of Christ on earth.

'The East *never* acknowledged the Roman Claims to a divinely granted supremacy,' asserts Dr. Gore. It was not to his purpose, apparently, to allude to the Formula of Pope Hormisdas, which early in the sixth century was proposed throughout the East as the test of communion with Rome, and of Catholicity. This formula was signed, we are told by Dr. Fortescue, perhaps one of the soundest scholars on Eastern Church affairs, by practically the whole of Christendom except the Nestorian and Monophysite heretics. It was signed by all the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople.[1] Probably the formula is one which

[1] d'Herbigny ('Theol. de Ecclesia,' ii. 315) asserts that the formula was signed by the Emperor Justinian and the Patriarchs John, Epiphanias and Menna, and 2,000 Eastern Bishops.

Bishop Gore and 'Anglo-Catholics' would find it impossible to accept, not merely because of its testimony to the Papal claims, but because it insists, *ex professo*, that the signatories must anathematise all heretics and all who remain in their communion or society. Thus Acacius was excommunicated because he was in communion with Mongos, a Monophysite. Whoever joined in communion with heretics deserved the same sentence of excommunication that they were subject to. Anglo-Catholic Bishops who keep in communion with notorious modernist and heretical bishops in the English Church would thus be held guilty of a modernism and heresies they may personally reject. So decides the undivided Church in the sixth century and again in the ninth, when its Bishops signed the Formula of Hormisdas.

What does it say as to the Papal Claims ?

The first salvation is to keep the rule of right Faith and in no way to wander from the laws of the Fathers. And that the words of our Lord Jesus Christ who said, 'Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church,' etc., may not be ignored is proved by the result, because in the *Apostolic See religion has always been kept immaculate. . . . Therefore we approve all the letters of Pope Leo*, whatever he wrote concerning the Christian Religion. Hence, as we have said, *following the Apostolic See in all things* and *teaching its decrees*, I hope that I may be worthy to be in the one communion with you which the Apostolic See teaches, in which is the full and true solidity of the Christian religion. Promising also that the names of *those who are banished from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is those who do not consent to the Apostolic See*, are not to be recited in the Holy Mysteries, etc. (Denz. 171.)

It is interesting to compare this uncompromising declaration of Catholic Faith, which secures reunion for schismatics only by an honest and unequivocal breaking-away from heretics and by submission to

the Pope, with the 'Henotikon' composed by the heretical Mongos and published by the Emperor Zeno as a means of uniting the heretics and Catholics in his dominions. The 'Henotikon' exemplifies the principles of '*re-union by compromise*' which are seen so clearly in the XXXIX Articles and the Lambeth Conference proposals to nonconformists. There is a certain parallel between the Eastern troubles of those days and the present situation in England. All desired reunion after the Schism. Hormisdas secured real reunion by submission; the 'Henotikon' merely succeeded in creating four parties out of two. The Lambeth Conference activities have only widened the gulf between the Anglo-Catholic party and the more distinctively Protestant party in the Church of England, without bringing nonconformity into communion with Anglicans.

The Formula of Hormisdas was the standard by which the Faith of the Eastern Church four hundred years before the Schism of 1054 was tested, and that test revealed its faith on the matter of Papal infallibility and supremacy to be substantially that of the Catholic Church to-day.

Let me come to my last argument, to me one of the clearest and most unmistakable. Has Bishop Gore ever considered it? '*Lex orandi est lex credendi*'; a Church's faith is embodied in its liturgy and can be gathered from it. This is a recognised rule in the Church since the fifth century (see Denziger, 'Enchiridion,' 139). The Greeks are conservative, and the most difficult thing to them in accepting the Formula of Hormisdas was not the admitting Papal claims, but the deleting from their Liturgies the names of dead heretics. Henry VIII had no such scruple in erasing the Pope's name from the Canon of the Mass when he usurped the Pope's place as the head of the Church. Many an Anglican to-day regrets the ease

with which Cranmer mutilated the ordination service to exclude the idea of a sacrificing priesthood. But the Greeks leave their liturgy untouched, and it is a testimony to the common belief of their Church at the time when the prayers were first added to it—a belief which they formally abandoned in 1054. I give two instances from the Offices of Popes, both Saints whose feasts are still observed in the Orthodox Church.

St. Martin was Pope from 649 to 655—over 300 years, therefore, before the Schism. He had been seized by the Eastern Emperor Constantius II, dragged to Constantinople, condemned for high treason, and banished to the Chersonese, where he died of torture and starvation. This hymn is sung in his honour on his feast, April 13 :

By what name shall I call thee, O Martin ; shall I call thee the *glorious ruler of the Orthodox Faith of all*, or the Sacred chief of the Divine dogmas *unstained by error* . . ., or the *most true reprover of heresy* ? . . . We know that thou wast the *foundation of Bishops*, pillar of the Orthodox Faith, teacher of Religion. . . . Thou *didst adorn the divine See of Peter* and since from that *Divine Rock thou didst guard the Church* unmoved, now with him (Peter) thou art glorified. (Fortescue, ' Orthodox Eastern Church,' pp. 56, 57.)

Can anything be clearer than the testimony read in Vespers on the Feast of St. Sylvester (January 2) throughout the Orthodox Church to-day ?

O Sylvester, our Father, thou didst appear as a column of fire, *anointed guide*[1] *of the Holy Council* (of Nicea), as a protecting cloud *thou hast snatched the faithful* from the Egyptian error (Arianism), and thou hast conducted them towards the divine light by reason of the *ever unerring teaching. A leader divinely appointed thou didst give the definitions of the Holy Fathers binding force.*[2] The abettors of error were confounded by virtue of the *Holy Spirit who*

[1] ἱερῶς προηγούμενος. [2] δόγμα ἐκρατυνᾶς.

acts through thee.[1] (See Nilles, S.J., 'Kalendarium utriusque Ecclesiæ,' t. 1, p. 57; d'Herbigny, 'Theol. de Ecclesia,' ii. 175.)

Yet Dr. Gore asserts that the Orthodox Church has *never* admitted the Roman Claims or believed in the Infallibility and Supremacy of the Pope!

These prayers could not have been introduced into the Liturgy after 1054. Their presence there testifies to the fact that the East once believed what the pre-Reformation Church at one time believed, and what all true Catholics still believe—the Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, the Successor of St. Peter, over the whole Church. He is 'the leader divinely appointed whose approval gives the definitions of the Fathers binding force.' A Council is a Council of the whole Catholic Church, when it assembles from the whole world the Bishops who are in communion with the Pope. Trent and the Vatican are Œcumenical Councils. Peter spoke through Pius IX, and his word is the word of Christ.

NOTE TO LECTURE II

Testimony from the History of the Council of Ephesus.

Before the Council of Ephesus which deposed the heresiarch Nestorius a letter was written to Pope Celestine by Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria. In it he says: 'Since it is the ancient custom of the Churches that affairs of this nature should be communicated to your Holiness, I am compelled to write and tell you (about Nestorius). . . . We have not openly and publicly separated from communion with him before communicating the matter to your Holiness. Be pleased therefore to prescribe what is right. Ought we to communicate with him or ought we openly to forbid people to hold communion with him?' (Mansi, iv. 1011–1015).

When the 198 bishops signed the sentence of deposition against Nestorius, they say they are 'compelled (to do so) by the sacred Canons and the letter of our most holy Father and fellow minister Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church' (Mansi, iv. 1296).

The Pope's legate was listened to without dissent when he declared 'It is known to all ages that holy and Blessed Peter, the Prince and Head of the Apostles, the pillar of the Faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, received from Our Lord the keys of the kingdom . . . who up to this time always lives in his successors and gives judgment. His successor therefore and representative, our holy and most blessed Pope Celestine, has sent us to this holy synod to supply his place' (Mansi, iv. 1296).

[1] πνεύματος τοῦ θείου τοῦ ἐν σοὶ ἐνεργοῦντος.

LECTURE III

THE CREEDS AND UNITY OF BELIEF

In our first lecture we established against Dr. Gore the dogmatic principle of belief. We believe because we are taught. Our selective exercise of private judgment is solely upon the question as to which Church among the existing claimants is the Church which Christ commissioned to be our guide. Once we have found the Church, our reason is not idle; but it is not occupied in the search for truth, except on such matters as the Church has left so far open and undefined. It is exercised upon the task of assimilating and endeavouring to grasp the full meaning of the Church's teaching.

The reason of Catholics is not atrophied with disuse. Thomas Aquinas, surely, used his reason upon matters of religious truth when composing his wonderful 'Summa Theologica,' and the mind of each Catholic is active in proportion to its capacity for the apprehension and comprehension of the Church's dogmas. A Catholic child who has learnt its catechism carefully knows more about God's truth than does Bishop Gore, 'the free-thinker in the best sense of the word,' after his life-long study and search by the aid of his private judgment. And likeness to a child has been commended by Christ. The child has been taught.

In the second lecture St. Peter's position was defined; and the words of our Lord and the belief of the Early Church were both shown as justifying the supremacy of the Pope in Christ's Church.

Peter had more than an honorary position of *primus inter pares* in the apostolic body.

In this lecture we contrast Peter's infallibility with Dr. Gore's theory as to the means Christ selected to secure unity of belief in His Church. This unity He clearly desired and commanded. Those who neglect His divinely ordained means of being orthodox and secure in their Faith are by that very fact outlaws from His visible kingdom upon earth, no matter how far their *bona fides* may excuse them, and be the occasion of their receiving uncovenanted graces and individual guidance and help for their soul in its isolation. But the covenant, as Dr. Gore says, 'was not with individuals, but with the one visible Church.' Let us hear Dr. Gore again:

> For maintaining unity, there were specially three links, the observance of which was of divine obligation: first there was the holding of the common faith, the Word of God, which in course of time was expressed in the Creeds, especially in what we call the Nicene Creed, and protected by certain decisions of General Councils, and for which the Court of reference was the New Testament interpreting the Old. In the earliest days before the New Testament books were written, or before they were formed into a Canon, the authority lay with the Old Testament, and the 'Tradition' which is frequently referred to in the New Testament and which was the substance of the Apostles' teaching. This was to hold the Church together in one common profession of truth. (I.)

Here we have Dr. Gore's idea of the means ordained by Christ to secure doctrinal unity, the '*holding of the common Faith*.' Peter and his successors have no special function in this scheme for securing unity.

The Nicene Creed is mentioned especially by Dr. Gore, but he declares that the See of Peter 'played but a minor part in the Council of Nicea' (II), and he would not admit that the Creed formulated by those Fathers received its binding force from Pope Sylvester's ratification. 'A leader divinely appointed, thou hast given the definition of the Holy Fathers binding force; the abettors of error were confounded by virtue of the Holy Spirit who acts through thee,' are words which Dr. Gore is unable to say with the Orthodox Church in its liturgy (see Lecture II, p. 29, *ad fin.*).

Christ, Dr. Gore admitted when introducing the great Petrine text, 'appeared determined to find a *strong foundation* for the spiritual fabric *in men and not in documents*' (I); but here the Bishop declared that the foundation of the spiritual fabric, the faith of Catholics, is to be found in documents, creeds and canons, *not* in men with a living voice; not in the successors of Peter the Popes of Rome.

With regard to the infallibility of the Church, it cannot be said that Dr. Gore admits any such doctrine. He says that

> there is in the Church, both of the Old and of the New Covenant, *something* infallible, that is the Word of God on which it rests. But our Lord gives the most awful warnings against mere reliance on ecclesiastical authority. For that may easily make the Word of God of none effect by its tradition. God will always be by His Spirit in the Church, but *there is no security offered us that the Church authorities* of the New Covenant *may not go wrong*, like the Church authorities of the Old Covenant, by relying on the bare tradition with scant regard to the Word of God of which the New Testament is the record. Again and again the evidence shows *that it has done so.* (II.)

The Church has not got any power to proclaim any Article of Faith nor the priest any right to lay it upon

the conscience of the faithful, *unless it can be verified in the New Testament.* The dogmatic authority of the Church is not anything more than the authority to proclaim, explicate and defend the original Word of God given through prophets, communicated in Christ and affirmed and implied in the New Testament. (III.)

Surely I am not doing Dr. Gore an injustice when I interpret all this as a declaration that the *ultimate* test of Christian Faith is the private judgment of the individual, satisfying itself that the creeds and all Church teaching is 'in the Word of God,' the written Scriptures, the Old and New Testament. The Church's utterances must be carefully scrutinised by this test, for he says there is no security that the Church authorities of the New Covenant may not go wrong in their teaching, and that 'again and again they have done so.'

Thus, Dr. Gore, and the Anglo-Catholics who follow him, are after all relying on the old Protestant principle of 'the Bible and the Bible only.' Church authority is no authority, till it has been verified in each pronouncement by reference to the Scriptures.

It is a humiliating fact, galling to those who, like the readers of the *Church Times*, are constantly boasting of their 'Catholicity' and condemning the 'Protestantism' of some of their Bishops and brethren of the Church of England, to have it brought home to them that, in spite of an external approximation to the Catholic Church in ritual, Church ornaments and other accidentals, and the holding certain Catholic truths, in the root-principle on which they hold their faith, they are as Protestant as the late John Kensit of the Protestant Alliance. The E.C.U. and the Church Association are after all far less removed from each other than might at first sight be imagined. The unity of the Church of England is admitted by the Roman controversialist, if by no one else; but

it is the unity of agreement in the Protestant principle of belief in the Bible alone interpreted by the private judgment of the individual. This follows logically from what Dr. Gore says above about Church authority.[1]

This principle of private judgment is logically insufficient, and practically inefficient to secure unity of doctrine in the Church.

It is logically insufficient, for it leaves unexplained the possession of the New Testament as an inspired Book. Church authority must first have been admitted as infallible in its selection of certain writings as inspired, and the rejection of others. When Dr. Gore says 'the dogmatic authority of the Church' is limited to 'the authority to proclaim, explicate and defend the original Word of God,' he is going beyond his principles, for nowhere in the New Testament or in the Old is this authority thus limited. Christ never hinted that there would be any New Testament. He never wrote a word Himself that we know of. We

[1] The *Church Times* (October 14, 1910) tries to make clear the rule of Faith:

'The Bishop, then, is the only head of discipleship. From him all discipline proceeds. But what is the nature of his authority? It is not original. It is derived. He represents the one Head of the Church: he is the Vicar of Christ. He shares that Vicariate with others and must act in agreement with them. A Bishop who takes an independent line disregarding his colleagues in the Episcopate is false to his office. The moral value of his authority ceases.'

Commenting on this, a writer in the *Month* (November 1910) asks pertinently apropos of the Pan-Anglican Lambeth Conference resolution (August 5, 1908): 'Were the eighty-four Anglican Bishops on the right lines who maintained the entire indissolubility of marriage, or their eighty-seven colleagues who would sanction the re-marriage of the innocent party?' The *Church Times* leader writer proceeds with his test. 'How shall it be known when a Bishop is falsifying his authority? We come here, as we always come, to the individual Christian conscience. *A Christian who knows or thinks he knows* his Bishop and Pastor to be so erring owes him no obedience. He owes him rather defiance' (*ib.*).

So we are back to the principle of the private judgment of the individual Churchman weighing up the authority of his Bishop whom he is supposed to regard as the Vicar of Christ!

are not told that He ever instructed His disciples to write a line. The composition of most of the New Testament appears to have risen from occasional circumstances rather than from the deliberate intention to compose a doctrinal handbook of the Church's Faith. Dr. Sanday says, 'A verse like 2 Cor. xiii. 14 shows that there must have been large tracts of important teaching which are imperfectly represented in our extant documents. When we consider how occasional these documents are in their origin, the wonder is not that they have conveyed to us so little of the Apostolic teaching, but that they have conveyed so much' (Hastings' 'Dictionary of the Bible,' vol. ii. p. 649).

'Preach,' 'teach,' that was Christ's command, and that primarily suggests the living voice of the teacher, not a varied, almost haphazard collection of documents.

It is practically inefficient, for—to quote Peter Wrenfels' verses :

> hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque
> invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.

'This is the book where each man seeks, and likewise finds the dogma he wants.' It fails under the pragmatic test. Nearly forty years ago *The Times* stated that 'England is reputed to contain 700 sects, each of them proves a whole system of theology and morals from the Bible' (May 13, 1884). Allowing for journalistic exaggeration, the statement points an obvious truth.

'For maintaining unity,' the Bible alone is the most inefficient principle conceivable unless the interpretation of the Bible is unified by a doctrinal authority as the rule, instead of the private judgment of the individual. As the American philosopher Brownson said of Unitarians, 'It is proverbial that

the Bible is like a fiddle on which a skilful performer may play any tune he pleases ' (' Works,' vii. 332).

Dean Farrar says :

The Romanist finds in it (the Bible) the Primacy of Peter, the Protestant discerns in it that Rome is the mother of harlots. The sacerdotalist sees in it priestly supremacy, Eucharistic Sacrifice and sacramental salvation. The Protestant cannot find in it any trace of sacerdotalism, nor any connection whatever between offering an actual sacrifice and the holy memorial of the Supper of the Lord. The Calvinist sees in it the dreadful image of wrath flaming over all the pages. . . . The universalist sees only the loving Heavenly Father, and explains the most awful forebodings as Oriental tropes and pictorial rhetoric. . . . (' The Bible,' pp. 143–4.)

Cardinal Newman puts the point still more clearly :

It is antecedently unreasonable to suppose that a book so complex (as the Bible), so unsystematic, in parts so obscure, the outcome of many minds, times and places, should be given to us from above without the safeguard of some authority, as if it could possibly from the nature of the case interpret itself. . . . Its inspiration does but guarantee its truth not its interpretation. . . . THE GIFT OF INSPIRATION REQUIRES AS ITS COMPLEMENT THE GIFT OF INFALLIBILITY (*Nineteenth Century*, Feb. 1884, p. 190).

Exactly. An inspired Scripture 'explicated' by an *infallible* Church authority is a sure and effective rule of Faith, and it produces that oneness of belief which Christ so desired, and which is manifested so clearly in the Churches united to Rome. An infallible Scripture subject to the explanations of a doctrinal authority that ' can go wrong and has often done so,' leaves men in scepticism and ignorance of Catholic Truth, or else throws them back on the inefficient and insufficient rule of private interpretation. Such a teaching authority as is always open to questioning

by the disciple is no authority. And Dr. Gore's limited Church authority is of this kind. As a link of unity in belief it is useless. It is pragmatically untrue, for it won't work!

Setting aside, then, this explanation which we undoubtedly find beneath Dr. Gore's somewhat confused interpretation of his rule of faith, let us turn to what he puts forth more explicitly, and even less logically. We repeat the passage:

> For maintaining unity there were three links the observance of which was of divine obligation: first, there was the holding of the common faith, the Word of God, which in course of time was expressed in the Creeds, especially in what we call the Nicene Creed, and protected by certain decisions of General Councils, and *for which the Court of reference was the New Testament interpreting the Old.* This was to hold the Church together in *one common profession of truth.* (I.)

The authority of these Creeds on Dr. Gore's own principles is from their agreement with the Holy Scripture, as *he* understands it. But on his principles the Arians and Monophysites have a right to reject the doctrine of the Nicene Creed as opposed to Holy Scripture, as *they* understand it. When the Creeds declare the common belief of its members in the 'Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,' the Greek Church understands the article as describing itself and excluding the Roman and Anglican Churches; the Roman Catholic understands it as describing *his* Church, and excluding the Greeks and Anglicans; and the Anglo-Catholic inventors of the 'Branch theory' understand it as including *all three* in the visible Church of Christ. All three imagine their interpretation of the words of the article to be consonant with the right understanding of the New Testament, 'the Word of God.' Can we say that the

mere use of the same formula in different senses has procured the reunion so desired by everyone? Has the retention of the Creeds caused the *apparent* schism to be, in truth, only an imaginary and not a real one, as Dr. Gore declares?

Does *any* genuine unity result from this 'link'? To confine ourselves merely to Dr. Gore's own 'branch,' there are men who hold responsible posts in the Church of England who declare: 'A Creed when accepted by any Branch of the Church must not imply that every member of it accepts in a literal sense every article of the Creed; it must express a general loyalty to the Church and its divine head, and a recognition of general unity in "fundamental belief"' (*Modern Churchman*, September, 1921, p. 329). Thus writes one of the Examining Chaplains of the Bishop of Lincoln.

'There is no one,' we are told, 'and certainly, no one of this (the Girton) Conference (of Modern Churchmen, 1921), who would accept the Nicene or Apostles' Creed literally and completely in the sense intended by those who formed these Creeds' (p. 328).

As Professor Sorley put it bluntly, these clergymen believe that '*there is not either in Church or Bible any infallible authority or doctrinal truth, and we should face the fact*' (*ib.* p. 318). The Principal of Ripon Hall, a Theological College for training the Church of England ministers, says: 'It is the besetting sin of theological controversialists to strive to condemn any view, not primarily on the ground that it is false, but primarily on the ground that the Church has condemned it already in some General Council 1400 years ago' (*ib.* p. 194).

The Creeds are said to secure general unity in *fundamentals* of belief. Surely the doctrine about Christ's Nature and Personality is a fundamental question. This is the doctrine given in answer to the

great question proposed by our Lord to St. Peter, 'What think you of Christ?' We are told by Church of England modernist clergymen that 'He was a perfect human, non-miraculous Christ' (Major, *ib.* p. 197). 'There is not a vast gulf between the Divine Nature and the Human Nature; God and man are akin.' 'Jesus did not claim to be the Son of God in a *physical* sense, such as the narratives of the Virgin Birth affirm, nor did He claim to be the Son of God in the *metaphysical* sense, such as is required by the Nicene theology. He claimed to be God's Son in the *Moral* sense *in which all human beings are Sons of God*' (*ib.* p. 276).

Another writer at that Conference, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, says: 'We must absolutely jettison the traditional doctrine that His personality was not human but divine' (p. 288). 'I do not for a moment suppose that Jesus ever thought Himself to be God' (p. 291). 'Jesus did not claim divinity for Himself,' says the Dean of Carlisle (p. 280).

'The Apostles' Creed pins us down to certain things which I strongly feel must be left open to the judgment of the individual, principally the Virgin Birth and the Bodily Resurrection' (p. 338), says another clergyman.

These Modernists demand 'freedom of thought,' that right of every member of the Church 'to think for himself,' which, according to Dr. Gore, was Christ's wish for His Disciples.

'The Church,' the Modernists say, 'grants a large measure of *liturgical* freedom, will it also grant a large measure of *doctrinal* freedom?' (p. 200). Anglo-Catholics have secured freedom from persecution in the matter of vestments and High Mass services with incense and candles; they reserve the Sacrament, and do many things openly and boldly that they neither wished to do or would have ventured to do

fifty years ago. They have secured a large measure of liturgical freedom. The Modernists demand a like freedom in doctrine. They wish to be free to use the best judgment of their reason and to disagree with the decisions of the Nicene Fathers who nearly 1500 years ago excommunicated Arius for the doctrines they hold to-day. Are they excommunicated by the Anglican Bishops who were solemnly called upon to examine and condemn these heretical publications? Some Bishops spoke boldly on the occasion, notably the Bishop of London, who said he was convinced that 'The Church of England was at the parting of the ways, and that the views of Mr. Major and his friends will lead to complete scepticism about the person of Christ in the next generation' (*Church Times*, May 12, 1922).

At the Upper House of the Convocation of York, however, it was declared that the '*Modern Churchman* writers are to be complimented on their endeavour to express the ancient doctrine in terms of modern thought, but are reminded of the need of caution and reserve.' The comment of the *Church Times* on the action, or rather the inaction, of the Anglican Bishops in this serious crisis is as follows:

'For the present the Bishops have effected nothing. They have not reassured the faithful, but they have encouraged the doubtful. The Modern Churchmen have been quick to see their advantage. "The issue of the controversy," they say in the draft of the official document, "inspires us with hope for the future of the Church of England. . . . The highest ecclesiastical authorities have, in effect, pronounced that the mystery of Christology . . . is not a closed subject, but is open to earnest and reverent inquiry. The great problems which the Fathers of the first six centuries strove so zealously to solve, are still our problems. We are not bound by their admittedly

imperfect solutions . . . but are allowed to pursue the path of inquiry. . . .'' ' Perhaps these words,' the *Church Times* adds, ' may show the Bishops what their timidity, their abrogation of their teaching office is likely to cost the Church. This timid resolution has encouraged the Modernists to affirm that there is not as yet a clear answer to the question : " What think you of Christ ? " ' (*Church Times*, May 12, 1922.)

Yet all these Bishops most solemnly pledged themselves, at their consecration, ' to be ready with all diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to the Word of God.' The Bishop of Gloucester, speaking in the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury (*Times*, May 3, 1922), said he believed that a pronouncement by the Bishops on this Modernist volume would be ill-advised. ' In matters of this kind,' he said, ' the appeal to authority had largely lost its power. They could not arrest intellectual thought by authority. It would be futile if they made the pronouncement.' What a contrast we have here to the condemnation and excommunication by Rome of the modernists the Abbé Loisy and Fr. Tyrrell. The Pope teaches Truth and is ever watchful to condemn Error.

Nor may the Anglo-Catholics refuse to accept responsibility for the heresies of the Modernists which flourish in the soil of the English Church. If they assert that the Church of England is part of the Catholic Church, they may not rightly repudiate large and important portions of their Church with whose views they disagree. The organism is a unit. ' Who are Anglo-Catholics ? ' the Bishop of Birmingham asked at their Congress in his Diocese, and he answered his own question by saying ' Every member of the Church of England.'

Modernism, tolerated and justified by a logical application of the principles Dr. Gore has laid down,

is a clear proof that the Church of England *is not part of the Catholic Church.* The Church in England was 'at the parting of the ways.' The shepherds of the flock sat down at the cross-roads, fearful of losing some wilful, headstrong members of the flock if they insisted on the right road being followed by all. Nay, some of the shepherds themselves doubted of the path. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* are words that must often rise to the lips of the Anglo-Catholics when contemplating their spiritual guides assembled in Convocation.

Bishop Gore declares that the first link for maintaining unity is '*the holding of the common faith*, the Word of God, expressed in the Creeds and conciliar decrees, for both of which the court of reference was the New Testament. This was to hold the Church together in one common profession of faith.' Why, the link is broken into a hundred pieces : the Church of England, which Bishop Gore declares to be part of the Catholic Church, cannot hold even its own members to a common faith on fundamental doctrines. What the Anglican Bishop Ryle said in a charge to his clergy many years ago is still more true to-day. 'Things have come to such a pass that it does not seem to matter a jot what a clergyman holds or believes' (1888). Macaulay uses words in his controversy with Gladstone that may be aptly quoted here.

When Mr. Gladstone goes on to tell us that this unity is the characteristic of the Church of England, that she is one in body and one in spirit, we are compelled to differ from him widely. The Apostolic succession she may or may not have, but *unity she most certainly has not, and never has had.* It is a matter of perfect notoriety that her formularies are framed in such a manner as to admit to her highest offices men who differ from each other more widely than a High Churchman differs from a Roman

Catholic, or Low Churchman differs from a Presbyterian. . . . The Religion of the Church of England . . . is in fact a jumble of religious systems without number. Is it not a mere mockery to attach so much importance to unity in form and name when there is so little in substance; to shudder at the thought of two Churches in alliance with one State and to endure with patience the spectacle of *a hundred sects battling within one Church*? ('Essay on Church and State.')

The Church of England [says that acute critic, W. H. Mallock] as a Church can be said to teach anything, only in so far as the individual exponents of its doctrines happen to agree on grounds that are independent of their membership as Churchmen. They do not agree because they submit to any central authority; but they constitute a diffused authority because they happen to agree. (*Nineteenth Century*, December 1898.)

Some years ago, before Lord Halifax had reached his present standpoint, Mr. Mallock wrote of Anglican Unity of belief:

The denial of the infallibility of the Church of Rome is almost the only point, except the existence of God, with regard to which all Anglicans remain really unanimous, and here their unanimity is more than real, it is passionate. It is a point of brotherly and intimate spiritual agreement between Lord Halifax and the gentleman whom he calls 'a blaspheming brawler': Mr. Kensit. ('Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption,' p. 78.)

This is only a repetition of what the first reformers had to deplore as the result of their breach with the central teaching authority, the Pope. 'On what ground of religion are the Churches which declared war upon the Pope agreed?' asks Beza writing to Dudith. 'Examine all from the beginning to end, and you will find hardly one thing affirmed by one which the other does not directly cry out against as an impiety' (*Ep. ad Andr. Dud.*).

Bishop Gore might fitly wail with Calvin: 'It is of great importance that the divisions that subsist amongst us should not be known to future ages; for nothing can be more ridiculous than that we, who have been compelled to make a separation from the whole world, should have agreed so ill amongst ourselves from the very beginning of the Reformation.' (*ad Melanchthon.*)

The recitation of the Nicene Creed has not produced a common faith in the members of the Church of England.

The spirit of tolerance and comprehension may be a good thing in politics and other matters, but it is not a mark of the Church of Christ as revealed in the Scriptures and exhibited in the primitive undivided Church. But Dr. Gore's basis for Faith, as analysed in the early part of this lecture, necessarily results in this chaos in the Church of which he is a Bishop. It so results because it has substituted the Protestant principle of private judgment for the Divinely established principle of an infallible doctrinal authority, an *Ecclesia docens*, which can and does teach the truth confidently; and which ruthlessly excommunicates heresy. This is what the Catholic Church exists to do.

What then do we offer instead of this fallible pseudo-authority 'explicating' the meaning of Holy Scripture and issuing Creeds and Canons which each Church member can claim to test by his private interpretation of the Word of God? We offer an infallible head of the Church, the visible Body of Christ on earth. We offer you successors to Peter, sharing his prerogative that he shall never teach false doctrine on matters of faith or conduct, when he solemnly and officially addresses the whole Church as its visible head, defining and making clear a doctrinal point, or proclaiming it as the Word of God handed over to him and deposited with him at the beginning.

Development of doctrine, the unfolding in clear explicit terms what was implicitly and obscurely understood in the past, there may be. This development is but a proof of the living Spirit of Truth within the Church. New dogmas are not additions from without, but development from within of what is logically contained in the original deposit.

The bud expands and the acorn becomes the oak; they grow without losing their identity. Their principle of life enables them to absorb nutriment and to reject what is useless or harmful. So, all the discoveries of truth in any department of human knowledge can be absorbed by the Church while her divine, living instinct rejects error. She can wait patiently. Hypotheses are expounded, and she is silent. When truth is proved, it is seen to be not antagonistic to what she received from the beginning and preserved safe and taught through the ages. She has never been obliged to retract what she has dogmatically proclaimed through her infallible head as God's revealed Word to man.

The Pope receives no new revelation. The Pope is not inspired, as Holy Scripture is. He is *assisted* by the Spirit of Truth that ever 'stands by,' and guards his teaching from error. He is bound to seek seriously to understand what revelation teaches on the point at issue before he speaks; but when he *does* speak, he proclaims to the individual members of his body scattered throughout the world, the absolute certain truths that are Catholic doctrine, the Word of God to men. The speculative opinions of theologians, to which reverence is due before, are received with an utterly new respect when Peter's successor proclaims them and confirms them as God's truth. When he speaks, men listen eagerly, not to weigh the theological *pros* and *cons* of each dogma, for *Roma locuta est.* Peter has spoken by Leo, or Pius IX, or Pius XI, or whoever the Pope of the day

may be, and Christ has spoken by Peter. *Causa finita est*, the matter is settled!

Cardinal Mercier spoke of the Bishops at the Conclave which elects the Pope, 'subscribing beforehand to a formula which they do not even wish to know, convinced that in matters of faith and Christian morality, not only he will not err, but *cannot* err.' Bishop Gore's comment is: 'This sort of autocracy inevitably makes a virtue of passive, unquestioning acceptance' (II). The acceptance is not passive; it is the active, eager assimilation of a truth now known for certain on God's authority, applied through God's own means of communication with the members of Christ's Mystical Body. The illustration of human credulity which Bishop Gore quotes from St. Ignatius of Loyola, and which so shocks him—'The white that I see I would believe to be black, if the hierarchical Church were so to rule it'—is surpassed by the simple faith of every Catholic who looks on what seems to be a white wafer, and knows that, after consecration, no bread is there but under the appearance is Christ the Son of God, really present in the Eucharist.

Bishop Gore is shocked because 'the acceptance of a peremptory authority levels all articles of belief which it proclaims. All are equally credible and obligatory whatever the conditions of evidence attaching to them' (II).

Precisely, for no Roman Catholic's Faith rests upon the evidence for the particular dogma. Each and all rest their belief on the authority of God who reveals them (*auctoritate Dei revelantis*) which authority reaches and is applied to the *Ecclesia discens*, the disciples of Christ in every age, through the infallible authority of the successor of St. Peter, the Pope of Rome.

Thus through the lifetime of the Church does Peter 'confirm his brethren,' thus is the spiritual fabric of

the Church's faith firmly built, 'not upon documents but upon men,' the Peters, the 'Rockmen' that sit on the throne of the Fisherman whom Christ Himself chose and made a firm foundation.

There is no promise that the Popes shall be saintly, or prudent, or wise; this is not needed. Dr. Gore himself admits, 'a most unworthy man can be the channel of the greatest spiritual gifts' (I). Alexander VI did not teach any false doctrine. Infallibility was his, in the technical sense claimed by the Church for its Popes. A Pope might lose his soul, and yet have been 'a safe guide'; for each Pope is Peter's successor and shares his prerogative.

'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall never prevail against it.' 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,' for they are safely guarded by the Apostolic See, and Christ has promised to be with it 'all days to the consummation of the world.'

LECTURE IV

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION AND ANGLICAN ORDERS

THE first of Dr. Gore's three 'links' to secure unity was shown in the last lecture to be useless for its purpose.

The second and third 'links' which, along with the Creeds and Canons, Dr. Gore proposes as a guarantee of Catholicity and bond of union, are the Sacraments and Apostolic Orders and Succession. We may conveniently group these two links, and consider them together in this lecture.

The Sacraments, Dr. Gore says, were 'social ceremonies,' and hence links of unity among those who received them.

The third link of connexion in a scattered but continuous society was the institution of the Apostolic ministry in communion with which all members of the body must remain.

This authoritative ministry was propagated by being imparted in succession to others in different degrees by the laying-on of hands. To be a member of the Church meant from the first to be in communion with its officers and in submission to their proper authority. (I.)

The Church of England has maintained the essential Catholic elements of the Creeds, the Sacraments and Apostolic Succession.

We are very thankful that recently the authorities of the Patriarchal See of Constantinople have formally, after careful and protracted examination, accepted the validity of Anglican ordinations. But we do not depend on these

external testimonies. We have searched into our title-deeds for ourselves, and feel sure that, judged by the standard of the undivided Church, we do not fall short in any essential. (III.)

Thus Dr. Gore.

Before examining once again the validity of the Anglican ordinations, let us state the position of bishops, recognised as true bishops by the theology of the Popes. This is necessary, as many Anglicans have a false idea of the Catholic theory of Episcopal powers and jurisdiction, and condemn it for imagined restrictions which do not exist. A bishop's power is a very real thing, and RomanCanon Law recognises this reality. I borrow this clear description of Episcopal rights and powers from an article which recently appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, and refer also to an article in the Dominican monthly *Blackfriars* (both November 1922). These articles were evidently occasioned by Lord Halifax's paper on 'Reunion with Rome,' at a meeting of the E.C.U., before the Sheffield Church Congress of 1922.

Father d'Herbigny thus writes in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*:

The hierarchy of the Church is, in the belief of the vast majority of Christians, but the continuation and development of the Apostolic College. It has the same functions, the same mission, the same authority. Each member of this College received the same sacerdotal powers. Peter and Paul, James and John, Barnabas and Timothy, each had power to baptize and confirm and absolve and ordain. Whether conferred by one or other of the Apostles, the same sacrament had from Christ the same saving power. Peter was no more of an Apostle than the rest. His successor is no more of a bishop than are other bishops. No one denies this truth.

It is in the *extent* of their pastorate that bishops differ one from another. To each bishop is confided a determinate portion of the flock. The Bishop of Kazan has

not the same charge as the Bishop of Moscow or of Canterbury. Bishops, when once they are consecrated, differ not in the power of orders, but in that of jurisdiction. ('Unity in the Church,' *I.E.R.*, Nov. 21, 1922, p. 517.)

The Episcopate, then, is of Divine, not papal, institution; nor is it, like the Patriarchates, something that gradually developed through the needs of an ever-spreading Church. The Council of Trent says definitely in its twenty-third Session, 'The Holy Synod declares that more than the other Ecclesiastical Orders, *bishops, who have taken the place of the Apostles*, belong to this hierarchical order; and the Apostle says they are *set by the Holy Spirit* to rule the Church of God.'

The Vatican Council, when defining the Papal Infallibility, says (fourth Session), 'This power of the Sovereign Pontiff does no hurt to the ordinary and immediate power of Episcopal jurisdiction whereby *bishops* "*feed and rule as true Shepherds the several flocks assigned to them individually*"—indeed, this (Episcopal power) is asserted, strengthened, and defended by the Sovereign and Universal Shepherd.'

Leo XIII, in his encyclical 'Satis Cognitum,' says, 'Although they have received neither full universal nor sovereign jurisdiction, nevertheless *they are not to be accounted Vicars of the Roman Pontiffs*, because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the peoples over whom they rule' ('Acta,' vol. 16, p. 197).

'*Ordinary jurisdiction*' is the power of ruling which a man has from the very fact of his having a certain office, and by virtue of that office; so that he exercises it in his own name and not in that of another. He who has only 'delegated' jurisdiction acts in the name of him who granted the jurisdiction. Diocesan bishops, though appointed by the Pope, act in their own name, and are true shepherds and rulers of their dioceses. They must, however, as subject to the

Shepherd of the whole flock, the Pope, render him obedience in their double duty of teaching and ruling.

The principles of right order demand that a bishop's jurisdiction should be defined in this way by the head of the Church.

The Pope would, however, sin against a Divine institution were he to make *all* bishops merely his Vicars, depriving them of ordinary and merely communicating to them delegated jurisdiction.

The Code of Canon Law emphasises the bishops' real power from God. By Divine institution they are set over individual churches which they rule with ordinary power under authority of the Roman Pontiff.

'That the bishops receive their appointment from a purely spiritual official,' writes Father McNabb, O.P., in the article above referred to, 'might well be considered a spiritual necessity or privilege by those who have to submit, as the bishops of the provinces of Canterbury and York have to submit, to appointment by a purely civil official, the Prime Minister.' We shall have to return to this matter later in another connection.

Jurisdiction is a reality, and it is a necessity if Church administration is to be anything but a chaos of indeterminate authorities, overlapping and interfering with one another. Surely Dr. Gore saw this point clearly when the 'Old Catholic' Bishop Matthews settled in England and used his probably valid powers to ordain some English clergymen who doubted the validity of the orders they had received from their own bishops in the Church of England. He was schismatical, and he was acting without jurisdiction. All validly consecrated bishops and ordained priests have *powers*, but they require *jurisdiction* before they can rightly use them. A judge is always a judge, but he cannot settle a case of dispute juridically in a railway train. His powers can only be validly used

when used in the place and over such cases as are included in his jurisdiction. Bishops' and priests' powers (except the particular power of absolution) can be used *validly*, but not *lawfully*, without jurisdiction.[1]

The men whom Bishop Matthews ordained and consecrated are probably real priests and bishops; but he had no right to make them so; he was without jurisdiction.

The successors of St. Peter are the source of administrative as well as doctrinal unity in Christ's Church. They determine the sphere within which a bishop's ordinary authority to rule and shepherd his flock may be rightly exercised. Only one Bishop, thus, has jurisdiction over the whole Church; other bishops have a limit to the use of their powers, and that limit is settled by the one who has jurisdiction throughout the whole world—the Pope. Thus Catholic bishops are elevated above all Erastian bishops, in that a Spiritual authority, which can be traced to Christ's commission to St. Peter, is the only authority which, as bishops, they recognise.

In England, after the Papal Supremacy was rejected, and the Sovereign became Supreme Governor of the Church, bishops were forced to take an oath saying:

I do verily testify and declare that Your Majesty is the only Supreme Governor of the Realm in Spiritual and Ecclesiastical, as well as in temporal things, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has *any jurisdiction* within this realm,[2] and I do acknowledge and confess to have

[1] This is the Roman doctrine in opposition to the heretical theory that the Sacraments are *invalidly* conferred by schismatics and heretics.

[2] The words are 'jurisdiction *within* this realm'—not 'jurisdiction *over* this realm.' Some Anglicans try to find in the oath merely the rejection of Papal authority of the feudal kind, which was recognised in England after King John's surrender of his kingdom to the Pope as a feudal lord.

'Spiritualities' they would interpret as merely the moneys and

and hold the bishopric of N. and the possession of the same entirely as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of Your Majesty and of the Imperial Crown of this Your Majesty's realm.

Surely this is a degradation of the Apostolic office which could not have been intended by Christ. The things that are God's *have* been rendered to Caesar.

Let us leave the question of jurisdiction and turn to a consideration of the powers conferred by valid Orders, sacerdotal and episcopal. Bishop Gore and all High Churchmen agree with us in the necessity of this Sacrament being validly administered, if the supernatural powers of the priesthood and of the episcopate are to be passed on from age to age, and not to die out in the Church. Apostolic Succession means to be linked by unbroken connection with the supernatural 'power house,' namely, the apostolic body that was charged with apostolic and priestly powers by Christ in the beginning.

A breach in continuity, like a break in an electric cable, prevents the power reaching those who are beyond the point of the break. One who has not bishop's orders himself cannot pass on the powers of a bishop by consecration, or of a priest by ordination. This is obvious.

Bishop Gore, speaking of the institution of the Sacraments, says of ordination: 'This authoritative ministry . . . was propagated by being imparted in succession to others in different degrees by the laying-on of hands,' and that 'the Apostles practised it from the beginning.' He does not allude to the

property attaching to a bishopric; the oath could only be taken in this sense by doing violence to the words and making them mean what they do not express.

Did Dr. Gore feel he was simply and honestly expressing a mere loyalty to his sovereign in matters that were 'Caesar's' when he rendered this solemn oath at his consecration?

essential supplement to this material act, namely, the 'form' or words used in close connection with the act, which are essential in the case of each Sacrament. This 'form,' these words, to be sufficient to convey the Sacramental power or grace must indicate the grace conveyed, and so make the meaning of the sign precise.

Thus, had Dr. Gore described Baptism as the sprinkling or immersing or pouring water upon a catechumen, he would have omitted an essential part of the Sacrament, viz. the words 'I baptise thee in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.'

The universal practice of the undivided Church, shown in all the ordinals which are everywhere accepted as valid instruments for conveying true priesthood or episcopacy, proves that the *form of ordination*, in conjunction with the laying-on of hands, *must express in words the priestly office or powers that are being given*, either by enumerating these powers, explicitly or symbolically, or by naming the office 'bishop,' 'priest,' and so summarising the powers in the words.

This was done in all parts of the Church, where the supernatural powers of a priest are part of the common faith of the people. To omit such words would be to invalidate the form. Just as to omit the words 'I baptise thee, etc.,' or to substitute for them other words, such as 'May God give you a long and happy life,' would invalidate a baptism, no matter by whom the rite was performed or how carefully soever the water was poured on the head of the child; and this, even though the new ritual bore the title, 'Form for baptising children into membership with Christ's Church.'

If an alternative form to the ceremony of marriage were at some future day introduced into the Prayer Book by authority of Parliament, and the parties were allowed to take each other solemnly 'till death

or divorce do us part,' no description of such a contract as 'The Sacrament of Christian Marriage' at the head of the ritual would make the marriage valid. The form denies, instead of expressing, the Christian contract.

Such baptisms and marriages would be null and void by 'defect of form,' *i.e.* of those crucial words which accompany the external acts, to make up the matter and form of every Sacrament, and so to constitute it a complete 'sign' of the special Grace, sacramentally received through that Sacrament.

The Pope has declared,[1] after an even more careful examination than that recently given to the matter by the authorities of the Patriarchal See of Constantinople, that the Orders of the Anglican Church are null and void: that there is not a single Anglican bishop who has any Episcopal spiritual powers, or a single clergyman who can celebrate the Blessed Eucharist—unless he has gone outside his Church and surreptitiously secured these powers from some schismatical bishop, whose orders were valid, though his jurisdiction was lacking.

Of this decision, Leo XIII said in a letter to Cardinal Richard, November 5, 1896: 'It was our intention to deliver a final and irrevocable judgment—*perpetuo*

[1] In this decision Pope Leo XIII but followed the example of every pope who has had occasion to deal with the matter since Julius and the days of Cardinal Pole. Rome has always reordained absolutely—not conditionally—clergymen who were converts from Anglicanism and previously ordained by the Anglican rite. Nor did Leo XIII give this absolutely final decision hurriedly. He appointed a commission of eight divines, of whom four were thought to be favourable to the Anglican claims. Free access was given to all Vatican documents; after six weeks of sessions, the 'acta' of this Commission were laid before a Committee of Cardinals. After two months' study and discussion this Committee gave an unanimous vote, condemning the Orders.

Finally, after a novena of prayerful consideration, Leo XIII published his decision in the Bull 'Apostolicae curae,' on September 13th, 1896.

firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem.' It deals with a 'dogmatic fact' tied up in an inference from an infallible principle.

Causa finita est! Rome will never reopen the question. Reunion, whether corporate or individual, involves acquiescence in this decision.

This is a 'hard saying'; perhaps the greatest stumbling-block in the path of clergymen who otherwise would submit to the Pope and enter the Catholic fold. They feel that to submit would be to deny the spiritual experiences of their priestly life; they cannot deny the evident fact that when they received Communion or Celebrated they *felt* Christ had come to them and the fruit of the Holy Spirit was produced in their souls.

They need not deny a single one of these experiences.

Bishop Gore says he 'must acknowledge the same reality of the fruits of the Spirit in the Society of Friends (the Quakers) which ignores Baptism.' Catholic theology and devotion recognises that what is called a 'Spiritual Communion,' without the Real Presence of Christ under the Sacramental species, may be the means of receiving, on occasions, greater Graces than are received when Christ is bodily present at a Sacramental Communion. 'God is not tied to His own ordinances,' as Dr. Gore declares; and men who believe sincerely in the priesthood of the English Church ministers, may receive an outpouring of Grace in their ministrations which, to them, is subjectively indistinguishable from strictly Sacramental Graces.

Their Church may be—and is—without the abiding Presence of our Eucharistic Lord; the Sacrament they have to fight so hard to 'reserve' may be—and is—but a wafer of flour and water; but their love and devotion, their prayers and fastings, their zeal to make God's House beautiful, and their ceremonies

seemly—all these things witness to hearts that are hungry for the Bread of Heaven, and God has made up to them, we hope and trust, for That of which Cranmer deprived them in his protestant, fanatical hatred of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Let us now see why Rome decided so definitely against the priesthood of the Church of England, while she admits the valid ordination and sacraments of practically every other religious body that left her to go into schism, or was driven from her by excommunication for heresy, during the life-history of her 1900 years.

The matter does not depend essentially on the historical question as to whether or no Barlow was ever consecrated a bishop.

Leo XIII gave his adverse decision, because the ritual used between 1559 and the year 1662 omitted to specify, in the '*form*' or words used in conjunction with the laying-on of hands, the nature of the gift conferred on the ordinand. The words neither mentioned the office 'priest,' 'bishop,' nor expressed the essential function of either office. The form was thus incomplete for over a hundred years after 1559. When in the year 1662 the second and actual ordinal of the Church of England was introduced, the name of the office 'priest,' 'bishop,' was inserted after the words 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost'—'for the office and work of a priest, bishop, etc.' That form would probably suffice—but there was no bishop to use it. It came too late. The hundred years without a valid ordination had left the Church of England without a priest or bishop. It was as though—to use again the simile from electricity—a cable ran sound and unbroken for 1559 miles, then it was cut and 103 miles of hempen rope followed. 1662 miles from the power station the proper cable begins again and runs to a point 1923

miles from the power house. The current does not pass. The ' hempen cord ' cannot transmit the power.

This ordinal of 1559, then, is the one that we must scrutinise. How came it to exist ? The English Church has had from its birth a valid, unquestioned rite for the consecration of its bishops, and the ordaining of its priests. Cranmer deliberately mutilated this ordinal. If he had taken any existing ordinal, that of the Greeks, or Maronites, or Nestorians, or Armenians, or Copts, or Syro-Jacobites, or others, he would have left the Church of England its priesthood.

Cranmer did not wish to keep the Catholic priesthood, for he was a whole-hearted Protestant in his hatred of the Mass, and a *priest's essential function is to offer the Holy Sacrifice.* The Mass must go—the Mass that High Church Anglo-Catholics recognise with us to be the thing that matters above all in Christian worship.[1]

It was the sacrifice of the Mass that Malachy saw

[1] The denial of the Sacrifice of the Mass by Cranmer remains externated or expressed in this mutilation of the ordinal. The mutilation revealed his intention to exclude sacrificial powers from the ministers ordained by a rite with such a history of its origin attached to it.

The ministers, whatever they might be, were not to be sacrificial priests. A writer on the subject of Anglican Orders uses a helpful illustration when he speaks of a man authorising another to pay money in his name and running his pen through the words ' and sign cheques ' on the printed form giving this authorisation. Cranmer's mutilation was this act, deleting sacrificial powers from the existing ordinal. His ministers might do many things : they might *not* offer sacrifice, as the man in the illustration might not sign cheques.

But this deletion of sacrificial powers destroys the Catholic priesthood. If the word ' priest ' is retained, it is only after it has been thus emptied of its Catholic meaning. The historical context of the new rite makes this clear.

It is not then the *interior* intention, or lack of intention in a consecrating bishop that invalidates the ceremony, but the heretical intention of the framers of the new rite that is appealed to by Pope Leo XIII in his condemnation : an intention that was expressed in the mutilation of the old rite.

in prophecy when he gave God's message, 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts: and I will not receive a gift from your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, my name is great *among the Gentiles*, and in *every place* there is *sacrifice*, and there is offered to my name a *clean oblation*' (Mal. i. 10).

Christ, the Great High Priest, 'according to the order of Melchisedech,' exercised His priesthood that night when He took bread and wine and changed them into His Own Body and Blood, and lay mystically slain before His Own Eyes at the Supper Room, looking forward, as Christian priests to-day look back, and representing the death that was to come to pass next day on Mount Calvary.

Gradually His Church has filled the earth, and to-day Malachy's prophecy is literally true. Catholic priests—'from the rising of the sun to the setting of the same'—in every place, are offering the Sacrifice and the Clean Oblation, through that priestly power which He communicated to the Apostles, by the command, 'Do this in memory of Me.' *That was their ordination moment.* The gift of the power to forgive sins was given later to men who were already priests—as has always been the case in the Roman rite. The Apostles were ordained at the Last Supper to 'Do This,' their priestly function of Sacrifice.

Let St. Cyprian speak for the many great Fathers of the East and West, who write of the Holy Sacrifice:

> If Jesus Christ, Our Lord and God, be Himself the Great High Priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and commanded to do this in remembrance of Himself, assuredly that priest who imitates what Christ did, truly acts in Christ's stead: and *he then offers* in the Church of God, the Father, *a true and complete Sacrifice* (Ep. 62, Ad Caecil.).

This, then, is the 'priestly' function—to offer sacrifice. There is to be sacrifice in our worship, and therefore priesthood had to be communicated to men.

If Cranmer's production, the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, is compared with the Sarum Missal, sixteen omissions can be detected, of which the evident purpose was to eliminate the idea of sacrifice from the worship of the Reformed Church of England. He denied the 'Real Presence' again and again, that doctrine so dear to devout Anglo-Catholics. He wrote 'No more is He corporally and really present in the due administration of the Lord's Supper, than He is in the due administration of Baptism' (Preface to Treatise on 'The Lord's Supper').

Again, 'As for saying Mass by the priest, as it was in past times used, it is neither a Sacrifice of propitiation, nor yet a sacrifice of laud or thanksgiving, nor in any way allowed by God, but *abominable and detestable*' ('Lord's Supper,' book v. p. 352).

The Anglican Bishop Ryle is perfectly correct when he says:

> The reformers stripped the office of the clergy entirely of any sacerdotal character. They cast out the words 'sacrifice' and 'altar' from the Prayer Book, and though they retained the word 'priest,' retained it only in the sense of elder or presbyter ('What we owe to the Reformation,' p. 14).

Again he says:

> The Reformers found the sacrifice of the Mass in our Church. They cast it out as a 'blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit. . . .' The Reformers found altars in all our churches. They ordered them to be taken down. . . . *The Reformers found our clergy sacrificing priests, and made them prayer-reading, preaching ministers.*

When the Anglican Bishops issued their reply to Pope Leo in defence of their Orders, a reply that has

been characterised as a Low Church document, they claimed that Sacrifice *was* mentioned in their Eucharist. Let us hear them and notice whether it is a true Sacrifice of the Body of Christ, or merely a metaphorical use of the words that they find in their Eucharistic Service.

'First we offer the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'—this is but human prayers, only a 'Sacrifice' metaphorically, such as is found elsewhere in their Prayer Book apart from the Communion Service; 'Next we plead and represent before the Father, the Sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins, and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for the whole Church'—this is an appeal to a Sacrifice that took place 1900 years ago on Mount Calvary, not the assertion of a Sacrifice *here and now upon the altar*; 'and lastly, we offer the Sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things, which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures': this is an oblation, not of Christ's Body, but of human things, the Sacrifice is again a metaphor: if taken strictly to mean more than this, it puts up another Victim and Sacrifice against Christ, the only acceptable Victim. 'This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic Sacrifice'; but the *reality* of the Sacrifice is gone, and their Lordships are accustomed to call their service by words used not in their strict theological sense, but in a figurative one.

I had just written the above words when my *Church Times* for January 5, 1923, arrived, and I find in the Correspondence columns a letter from Canon Rust of Lincoln, which contains the following passage apropos of E.C.U. Report on Prayer Book Revision:

> The restoration of the Canon certainly presupposes that the Eucharist is an oblation, or if you will, a Sacrifice.

But we all agree that it is a pleading before the Father of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, as well as a means of Grace and a bond of fellowship. I take it that what we should probably call the *pleading of a sacrifice*, is exactly what an Anglo-Catholic means by the *offering of a Sacrifice*.

But surely if this is all that the English Church means by Sacrifice, a pious layman may 'offer Sacrifice' without being ordained. He may 'offer Sacrifice' as he hangs on to a strap in the Tube, coming home from business in the City, by turning his thoughts back to Calvary, and 'pleading before the Father' the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross for his daily sins. And the bishops of England, in their reply to the Bull of Leo XIII, seem to claim nothing more than Canon Rust. Whether he is right or wrong in thus interpreting the views of the extreme Anglo-Catholics is not a matter of doubt. Many of them mean by the Eucharistic Sacrifice what the Roman and Greek Churches mean; and that is a doctrine that Cranmer and the Reformers rejected with hatred; it was to exclude this real and true Sacrifice, that the Ordinal and Missal were mutilated. What other reasonable explanation can be found for the wholesale changes made by Cranmer?

Nor is this rejection merely a momentary phase in Elizabethan times. It has been the normal belief of the English Reformed Church—a belief shown in the destruction of altars and the desecration of altar stones at the beginning, and the substitution of Mattins as the normal Sunday Service, instead of the Mass, for some three hundred years. The disbelief of the Real Presence was often shown in the carelessness and disrespect used with regard to the crumbs left over, and the casual treatment of the elements. The 'Black Rubric'—so detested by modern High Churchmen—was accepted as unmistakably and clearly enunciating

the belief of ordinary churchmen and clergymen for the greater part of the lifetime of the Establishment; that is, until the 'Anglo-Catholic Revival' began to popularise a return to that Catholic belief about the Eucharist, which was supplanted in the time of Elizabeth by the doctrine which is so clearly taught in the rubric referred to.

Let us hear the words of this rubric which still remains in the Communion Service in the Prayer Book.

> Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; IT IS HEREBY DECLARED, That *thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done*, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the *natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here*; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one. (Book of Common Prayer: at the end of 'the Communion.')

If a present-day extreme 'Anglo-Catholic' carefully confines his worship to churches of the type now fairly common—though once unknown—in the Establishment, where High Mass with incense, the preaching of the Seven Sacraments, the practice of Reservation, and the hearing of Confessions all speak of Catholic ritual and belief; if he confines his religious newspaper

reading to the columns of the *Church Times*, where the reiterated use of the words 'we Catholics' seems almost 'to protest too much,' it is not impossible for him to take the Catholicity of his Church for granted. Like the Petrine text 'inscribed in vast letters round the dome of St. Peter's Basilica,' of which Dr. Gore speaks, these things '*impress the imagination*' of the man I am describing. He can develop the background of his picture. He can imagine the twentieth-century English High Church he is familiar with, as a continuous river flowing down through the three hundred and more years until it links up with the clearly Catholic stream of the Pre-reformation Church. If he is a student and a historian, his imagination is seen to be far astray in the picture it has painted, and he must turn back with a sigh. At best he may be able to trace a tiny trickle of Anglo-Catholic belief and practice, flowing down almost invisible (at times it must seem to be underground), beside the wide Protestant current of the Low Church belief and practice, which was the norm, little, if at all, distinct from the Continental Protestantism which was its source.

Bishop Gore says :

> I cannot speak as one who can be enthusiastic about the Anglican Church, as it has shown itself in history. I confess that its history fills me with profound humiliation. . . . I find its continuous Erastianism, its complacent nationalism, its frequent deafness to the most urgent and obvious moral calls, its long continued 'identification of itself with the interests and tastes of the upper classes'; these and other continuous traits of the Church of England I find, I must confess, depressing and humiliating. (III.)

Some of these 'traits' I shall return to in my final lecture. The Bishop has omitted to express a sense of humiliation about the past and present attitude of

his Church towards the 'Emanuel,' 'God with us,' in His Eucharistic Presence and Sacrifice.

To sum up. In the words of the 'Judicious Hooker,' whose judgment we accept as far as it concerns the Establishment: 'Sacrifice is no part of the (English) Church's ministry . . . the Gospel hath properly no sacrifice.' Yet the name 'priest,' he says, may be retained without harm, for when men hear it 'it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of Sacrifice than the name of a senator or alderman causeth them to think of old age' ('Ecc. Pol.' v. 78).

The Church of England is without Episcopate and Priesthood in the old and Catholic sense of the word, for Cranmer did his work deliberately and well. For over a hundred years its ordination 'form'—to use the words of Dr. Lingard—'might have been suitably used at the induction of a parish clerk.' It has lost its Apostolic Succession, and therefore its Catholicity. Valid orders would not have conferred Catholicity, but their loss proves the Church of England to be no part of the Catholic Church of Christ.

LECTURE V

CONSTANTINOPLE, CANTERBURY AND ROME

'Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.'
(Rome) 'Whence the rights of venerable Communion flow to all.'
St. Ambrose.

AND now we come to sum up the results of our criticism of Bishop Gore's theory of the Catholic Church.

Have the Easterns and the Anglicans a right to the name Catholic which is so dear to them, or is that name the exclusive title of those bodies scattered all over the world who are in communion with, and willing subjection to, the Apostolic See? In a word, are Roman Catholics the only Catholics? Rome asserts that they are.

If Bishop Gore's objection to a dogmatic Church were founded on Scripture, the doctrinal comprehensiveness of the Church of England would be a point in its favour, and the autocratic, absolute dogmatism of the Church of Rome, which makes her unique in the modern world, would justify Dr. Gore's rejection of her claims. But we saw clearly that Christ and St. Paul very definitely taught and exemplified the dogmatic principle.

Intolerance of error, a Divine dogmatism was seen to be a mark of Christ's Church. The Church of England is 'uncatholic' because it is without a mind and voice to teach definitely a coherent doctrine, and insist on that doctrine being accepted as a test of

membership; and because in practice there is no visible unity of belief, and therefore no possession of the Truth among its members. The 'Creeds' fail to produce unity among Anglicans. The third lecture of this book developed this point. How far there is unity of belief in the Eastern Group, it is not to my purpose to examine in detail here; suffice it to say that though there is vastly more doctrinal unity in the Eastern Churches than in the Church of England, yet there is considerably less agreement than is generally supposed by Anglicans. But we consider the claims of Constantinople more in relation to schism than in relation to heresy. Constantinople, like Rome, claims to be the whole Catholic Church, and would assert 'Orthodox' Catholics to be the only Catholics, as Rome asserts that Roman Catholics are the only Catholics. Both reject the Anglican claim to be part of the Catholic Church.

The effort of the English Church to secure reunion with the Orthodox Church has not attained its object—nor can we believe that any real advance has been made towards attaining it. Whether communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople would be a guarantee of being in possession of Catholic Truth is a question that history answers very definitely in the negative. Constantinople has been too often in the wrong to be a norm of right belief or order. Photius (A.D. 852) was the sixtieth Bishop of Constantinople. Of those who preceded him in the See, twenty-two were heretics, whom Dr. Gore himself would recognise as such, and twenty-one Patriarchs were deposed for various reasons. The history of that Erastian See is the history of the opinions of the Emperors to whom the Patriarchs were piteously subject. Between the years A.D. 323 and A.D. 852 Constantinople was in schism altogether for 203 years. Fortescue gives the list of dates:

Fifty-five years during the Arian troubles (343–398), 11 years because of St. John Chrysostom's deposition (404–415), 35 years during the Acacian Schism (484–519), 41 years because of Monothelitism (640–681), and 61 years because of Iconoclasm (726–787), and in every one of these cases Constantinople was on the wrong or heretical side : in every one Eastern and Western Christians now agree that Rome was right (' Orthodox Eastern Church,' p. 96).

Reunion with a See that has such a history could hardly be of great doctrinal utility to Canterbury !

Yet reunion with Constantinople would be no easy matter for the Church of England to secure, much as Anglo-Catholics desire it. When the Lambeth Conference on Reunion was sitting, the Archbishop of Canterbury approached Constantinople, and an official delegation was sent, at his invitation, by the Patriarch. This delegation, in spite of the ' hard pressed ' situation in the East and the obvious temptation to use ' phrases such as would please ' in ' the Eastern way,' was very careful not to commit itself by any act which might be construed into being ' in communion ' with the English Church. It was in ' communication ' with it, holding many interviews with the English ' Committee on Reunion with Episcopal Churches,' and studying the situation with a view to making an official report to ' The Most Reverend and Holy Synod of Constantinople.' This report is a very uncompromising document, and it must have chilled the hopes of the High Churchmen, who were relying on the effect of their *Declaration of the Faith of the Church of England*, to convince Constantinople of the Catholicity of their Church. Let me remind you of the main articles of that ' Declaration.' Bishop Gore signed it along with very many ' Anglo-Catholic ' clergymen. Needless to say, the Archbishops and Bishops governing Sees in the English Church abstained from lending the weight of their authority

to a document so widely differing in content from the 'henoticon' which they were offering to Nonconformists at the Lambeth Conference. The Declaration entirely misrepresented their collective belief, if such a phrase can be used of so heterodox a body as the English Episcopate. The Declaration appeared in the *Church Times* of April 28 of last year (1922). The Signatories affirm that they hold the genuine teaching of the Church of England to be:

(1) 'That of the undivided Church of Christ set forth in the Scriptures, handed down by the Holy Fathers and traditions of the Church, reaffirmed and safeguarded by Oecumenical Councils.'

(2) 'This faith notwithstanding individual departures therefrom has not been forsaken by the English Church.'

(3) 'As touching any matters in which the Church of England may seem in the opinion of Eastern Theologians to have departed from the dogmatic decrees of the Oecumenical Councils, we declare that we know of no such departure, and we accept the Faith as expounded by those Councils.' . . .

(6) After enumerating the seven Sacraments they say, 'We adhere to the custom of calling these seven rites specifically Sacraments.'

(7) They claim Apostolic Order through the Bishops, 'to whom it has been transmitted in like manner by an uninterrupted succession from the days of the Apostles.' With the purpose 'that we should offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed,' and 'Sacramentally absolve sinners who repent and confess their sins.'

(8) 'We hold that by consecration in the Eucharist, the bread and wine . . . are changed and become the true Body and true Blood of Christ. We hold that Christ thus present is to be adored.'

(9) 'We agree with the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church that honour should be given to the Holy and Ever Virgin Mother of God, and the Saints departed; and that there is a legitimate use of sacred images, and that in our public

and private prayers we should ask the benefit of the intercession of Saints.'

(10) 'We account the XXXIX Articles of Religion as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century and to be interpreted in accordance with the Faith of the Universal Church of which the English Church is but a part.'

Truly a wonderful document, where Englishmen tactfully adopt 'the Eastern way,' and 'Greek meets Greek' in the use of 'phrases such as would please.'

But would the honest, blunt English Churchman of to-day, or the High Churchman of a hundred years ago, recognise this description of his Church's Faith? Seven Sacraments, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence as bread and wine are changed and become the Body and Blood of Christ, Who is to be adored in the Sacrament, Auricular Confession, the Blessed Virgin and Saints to be prayed to and their Images used, and finally the setting aside of the XXXIX Articles (which in their obvious sense reject these doctrines) as a document of mere ephemeral and secondary importance. The Declaration did not regard it as necessary to mention that the 'Filioque' is recited by the Anglican Church in its Creed—that 'Filioque' which is advanced by the Greeks as Rome's great mark of heresy.

The Bishop of Durham, contrasting this Declaration of Faith with the Report of the Lambeth Conference offered to Nonconformists, justly remarks, 'These declarations conflict so sharply in spirit, substance, and outlook that they must move the wondering curiosity of the public and anxious thought of considering Churchmen. We cannot invite the representatives of other Churches to negotiate about re-union until we have reached agreement as to our position. . . . Can we rightly approach Protestant

Churches with one standard of doctrine and the Eastern Church with another ? ' (see *Tablet*, July 1, 1922).

The official delegation who stood by and saw the accredited authorities of the English Church bargaining with the Nonconformists were men who could not fail to recognise that the Declaration of Faith was but a party document: and the existence of such contradictory views in one Church was carefully noted by the representatives of the Holy Synod.

In their official report the delegates show themselves in no way deceived as to the real beliefs of the Anglican Church. We quote at length from the document, for it makes it perfectly clear that corporate reunion with the East is quite outside practical politics for very many years to come. The Church of England will have to become quite other than it is before such a union is possible.

We found it necessary to make clear that our Church has not yet, like the Western Church, made a public pronouncement regarding the possibility of the salvation of Christians outside her bosom, but that, as was to be expected, it does not accept those who do not belong to it as forming part of the Church in the true and proper sense of the word. Accordingly, whenever it uses the term 'Church' with regard to the Churches which are not orthodox, it uses it in a wider sense and not in the narrow and proper sense of the word (translated report, p. 11).

While with us, the true member of the Church who continues in organic union with the whole, must accept the whole of our teaching, share canonically in the Holy Sacraments, and believe in lawfully settled ecclesiastical principles; in the English Church, men differing from each other in faith, not in things indifferent and non-essential, constitute one undivided whole. . . .

We could not agree to views of such a nature without abandoning the foundation on which our Church is built (p. 11).

In view of the fact that the work of union would be

strongly advanced by the abolition of the well-known XXXIX Articles of the Anglican Confession, we thought it would not be offensive to propose their general abolition (p. 12).

As long as in England no separation between Church and State is made . . . it appears in fact that only a revision of these articles will be possible. This revision, being invested with a competent authority, would evidently supply, in great measure, the place of a final abolition of the Articles (p. 13).

As to Baptism administered by the English priests, we could not accept its validity either *simpliciter* or 'by economy.'

In connection with the acceptance of Anglican Orders by Constantinople, for which Bishop Gore expresses his thankfulness, it is well to note that the Orthodox Church demands the introduction of the 'epiclesis' into the Communion Service. This the delegates declare to be *necessary to change the gifts* in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

We can sum up the report made to the Holy Synod by the Delegation from the Patriarch of Constantinople thus :

(1) Only those are part of the Church in any 'proper sense' who belong to the Orthodox Church.

(2) The comprehensiveness of the Anglican Church could not be acquiesced in without abandoning the foundation on which their (Orthodox) Church is built.

(3) The XXXIX Articles must be abolished or at least revised by a competent authority—presumably so as to express the whole Orthodox teaching.

(4) Baptism, as administered in the Church of England, is regarded as invalid ; so presumably corporate reunion could only take place

by a wholesale re-baptising of Anglicans from the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop Gore down to the latest Anglican baby, baptised by infusion instead of total immersion.

(5) The Eucharist as celebrated to-day throughout the Anglican Church is invalid, and there is no Mass, Real Presence, or Sacrifice, as the invocation of the Holy Ghost (epiclesis) is omitted.

Surely these demands, clearly expressed in the Report of the Official Delegation from Constantinople, are unlikely to be complied with. Can Anglicans hope that such measures will be embodied in a Bill passed by Parliament at any future date in England ?

There is no prospect of reunion between the Eastern Church and the Established Church of England.

Nor would such reunion, even if it came about, cause Rome to modify in one jot or tittle her claim that the Pope is the divinely constituted, infallible head of Christ's Church, and that every Catholic is bound to be in communion with the Pope. Rome can and does concede much to Churches that have returned to submission after schism. She might conceivably concede a ritual in the vernacular ; she might allow a married clergy ; she would certainly give to the Bishops of the English Church far greater authority and freedom than they now possess. She might give the Church a genuine freedom to choose its bishops instead of the mockery of the present-day ' congé-d'élire,' accompanied as it is by instruction to elect the individual selected by, perhaps, a Baptist Prime Minister on the advice of his private secretary.[1]

[1] In a letter to the *Church Times*, November 24, 1922, we read : ' Mr. Lloyd George replied to the Archbishop of Canterbury in effect, that he always had taken advice (about the appointment of Bishops) ; but not long after made the jocular but exasperating remark that it was his private secretary who chose the Bishops.'

Rome might give all this—but there are concessions she cannot make without ceasing to be that which Christ framed her, and thus falsifying His promises of her indefectibility. 'Non possumus!' has been on the lips of a Pope more than once, and the utterance was, at times, heroic.

Compromise on the matter of the divorce of Henry VIII. would have saved England for the Catholic Church. A repudiation of the Vatican Council would probably regain her: but 'the end does not justify the means,' and the compromise will *never* be made.

Communion with Rome would not be worth having if Rome purchased it by the suicide involved in such a compromise. If the 'Apostolic See' is proved fallible by any self-contradiction, then God's truth is gone from the earth, and no logical foundation for Faith remains.

Let us turn back, then, to this last point. If Constantinople, Canterbury, and Rome are out of communion with each other, can they be all parts of the Catholic Church? Is the schism which exists between the three such a grievous wound that it destroys the Catholicity of any or of all of them?

Doctor Gore recognises that there is a certain kind of schism which does not exclude from the Catholic Church. We agree with him; there *is* such a kind of schism; where individual churches may have been out of communion with each other for a time, and yet each remained part of the Catholic Church. But that kind of schism is not the kind that exists to-day between the Easterns, Anglicans, and Rome. Let me use a mechanical illustration to make my point clear. Picture a chain of three links, joined so that each link is held by the other two. The links represent the Eastern, Anglican, and Roman Churches in full communion with each other. Break the bond so that

the links representing the Eastern and Anglican Churches are separated from each other temporarily, *while each holds firm to the Roman link.* You will have here 'schism,' but not such schism as excludes from the Catholic Church: for each is linked to the divinely established centre of unity, 'the Apostolic See,' in which sit the successors of St. Peter, on whom the Church was founded. Each rests on that foundation. There were temporary schisms of this nature in Church history.

It was not of such partial schisms that the Fathers spoke such clear and terrible sentences, but of the more deadly breach which separated Churches from the See of Peter. As Cardinal Manning says so truly in one of his sermons:

> There would be no such sin as heresy if there were not a divine authority teaching among men: no such sin as schism if there were not a divine law of unity. Heresy would be mere error of opinion, and schism a lawful freedom of separation, if it were not for the divine authority of truth, and the divine law of unity ('Serm. Ecc. Sub.' iii. p. 6).

He who breaks with Peter and is not in communion with him has broken with the Catholic Church and is outside the Sheepfold of Christ.

St. Anselm says:

> It is certain that he who does not obey the ordinances of the Roman Pontiff . . . is disobedient to the Apostle Peter, *nor is he of that flock which was given to him by God* (Lib. IV. Ep. 13).

St. Augustine, in his controversy with the Donatist schismatics, says strong things about their schism which have a close application to the Anglican situation:

> You are with us in Baptism, in the Creed, and other Sacraments of the Lord, but you are not with us in the

spirit of unity and the bond of peace : *finally, you are not with us in the Catholic Church* (St. Aug. ' Ad Vinc. Rogat.' Ep. 93 (48)).

The Donatists stood apart, a reforming body with a compact group of some 400 bishops united in doctrine, possessed of Creed, Apostolic Succession, Sacraments, and all that Dr. Gore declares to be necessary for membership in the Catholic Church, but they are definitely *excluded* from that Church by the great Doctor St. Augustine because they are out of communion with Rome and stand an isolated unit, a detached and therefore dead member ; a branch cut off ; outside the Sheepfold. ' *You are not with us*,' he says, in communion with the rest of the Catholic Church scattered throughout the world, yet linked by its communion with Peter's See. Their sin is ' The Sacrilege of Schism which exceeds all other crimes ' (' Cont. Ep.,' Par. ii. 4).

' On those whom the Donatists heal from the wound of idolatry, they inflict the still more grievous wound of schism ' in his judgment (' De Bap. Con.' i. 8).

Speaking of the Reformation period, Bishop Gore says :

A great part of what was most intelligent and progressive in Europe left the ancient Catholic Church and set up new organisations based, as they believed, on the pure word of God, so to speak, rediscovered. That they had abundant excuses none can deny. But I think also none can deny that in establishing what they thought were pure Churches on a quite new basis, they were *violating fundamental principles of Catholicism* as it was from the beginning. . . . God has so manifestly blessed the Protestant Churches who deserted the ancient Catholic structure, and the Holy Spirit has so manifestly shown His action through them, that they are proved by their fruits to be at least *as true parts of the Church as any ever planted.*

Thus speaks Dr. Gore of those whom St Augustine

would condemn as schismatics. How differently does their sin appear to St. Irenæus. His words seem to be prophetic of the sixteenth-century disruption. 'Those that cleave asunder and disrupt the unity of the Church shall be punished by God. They cut in pieces the Great and Glorious Body of Christ. The *mischief of their schism more than counterbalances any reformation which can be brought about by them.*'

St. Cyprian says that the devil 'invented heresies and schisms to subvert the faith and corrupt the truth and divide the unity. . . . He *snatches men from the Church itself.*'

St. Ambrose speaks of an application of this test for Catholicity applied by his brother Satyrus.

> [Satyrus] summoned the bishop to himself, nor did he believe any Grace a true Grace except it be of the true faith; and he enquired whether he was *in communion with Catholic bishops, that is, with the Church of Rome* . . . nor did Satyrus believe that the faith was to be found in schism. For although they held the faith concerning God, they did not hold it concerning the Church of God (St. Ambrose, 'De Excess. frat.' i. 47, Migne, xvi. 1306).

Alcuin, a ninth-century English scholar, had the same test in his day in England. 'It is evident that those who, on account of any disagreement, discontinue the customary commemoration of the Apostolic Pontiff in the Mass' (as Henry VIII. did later in removing the Pope's name from the Missal) 'are *separated from the communion of the whole world*' ('De Divinis Officiis,' c. 10).

To be linked to the Apostolic See was regarded as essential to Catholicity in the pre-Reformation English Church. In their quarrels with the Pope in his capacity of feudal ruler after the time of John, our ancestors never denied his ecclesiastical supremacy as successor to St. Peter. Referring to Papal decisions

on appeals made from England, Archbishop Peckham of Canterbury says that those who reject such decisions 'are not to be counted as Catholics, but rather as heathens and publicans' (Wilkins' 'Concilia,' ii. 88).

The Diocesan Synod of Exeter in 1287 but quoted the universally recognised doctrine of the English Church when it defined a schismatic as 'one who withdraws from the unity of the Roman Church' ('Schismaticus, id est recedens ab unitate Ecclesiæ Romanæ,' Wilkins' 'Concilia,' ii. 167). And at a definite date this was done in England, and the English Church, separated from the Roman obedience, ceased to be Catholic.

St. Jerome wrote: 'What then is his (Rufinus') faith? If he says the *Roman, then are we Catholics.*'

Again he writes to a Pope: 'I am linked in communion with thy Blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. On that rock I know that the Church is built. Whosoever shall eat the Lamb *outside this house* is profane. . . . *Whosoever gathereth not with thee scattereth*' (Ep. xv).

And in his next letter (xvi.): 'Meanwhile I cease not to cry out: *if anyone is joined to the See of Peter he is mine.* . . . I beg your Blessedness to let me know by your letters with which bishops in Syria it is my duty to communicate.' The test of Hormisdas was 'those who are banished from the communion of the Catholic Church, *that is those who do not consent to the Apostolic See.*'

Communion with Peter's Apostolic See is not merely for the *bene esse*, but for the *esse* of a National Church that remains a member of the Catholic Church of Christ.

The Church of England, through its newly formed Elizabethan Episcopate, acquiesced in a separation that the Martyrs of Tyburn and the exiles for the

Faith protested against so bravely, if ineffectually. 'Anglo-Catholics' have no right to point to the protests and martyrdom of those who died rather than accept the Supremacy of the Sovereign in place of that of the Pope, as a proof that the English Church never went into schism. Their Church has no valid continuity with the Church of the Martyrs. Their Church was born when its bishops took the oath that repudiated Peter's successors in the Apostolic See. Even if they had kept the pre-Reformation faith—of which Elizabeth and her XXXIX Articles actually deprived them; even if they had kept valid apostolic orders—of which Cranmer's mutilated ordinal deprived them; even though they keep the Creeds of Christendom, they lost their Catholicity when they lost communion with the Apostolic See through their national repudiation of the Pope by an act of Parliament.

St. Jerome says: 'One was chosen amongst the twelve that by the institution of a head all opening for schism might be avoided' (Adv. Jov. Lib. i.). But the chosen one was rejected, and the schism came through that rejection. The Visible Society of the Church cannot contain members that reject its authority—it expels the rebellious members, and they cease to belong to the Society.

Dean Inge spoke truly when he said:

> A Western European who rejects the authority of the Pope can no more be a Catholic in the institutional sense of the word than President Wilson can be an Englishman. It is surely for the Great Church and not for seceders from its rule to decide who are rebels, and the decision has been given against us (December, 1916, quoted in 'Catholic and Roman,' by H. E. Hall, p. 5).

The *Church Times*, in answer to a correspondent, naively replies to a question: 'The Roman Schism is an expression only used concerning the Church of

Rome in England where, *if she be not in Schism, the Anglican must be!*'[1] So a Roman Catholic priest travelling round the world and welcomed as a Catholic in every part of it, because of his letters from Cardinal Bourne, is a schismatic when at home in England; while the Archbishop of Canterbury, the extent of whose jurisdiction depends upon the flying of the Union Jack, and whose Catholicity is admitted by no one, except some members of his own national Church, is paradoxically to be called the *real* Catholic!

Bishop Gore, in his 'Religion of the Church,' says: 'The obligation to continue in communion with the Bishops provided the necessary bond. The succession of Bishops guaranteed the continuity of the Church, and the communion of Bishops with one another was intended to guarantee the unbroken fellowship of the Church' (p. 71). The isolation of the English Bishops has broken the bond; and the fellowship of the Church

[1] In another answer to a correspondent (*Church Times*, November 1900) we are told: 'The Roman body in this country is a schismatical body: their own writers have admitted that their hierarchy is a new introduction having no continuity with that which existed before the Reformation.' It has the continuity of the Old Catholic pre-Reformation Faith, never abandoned by the little body of faithful Catholics who survived, persecuted and outlawed, and who received the Sacraments from heroic mission priests under the authority of Vicars Apostolic who acted in the name of the Chief Bishop himself. They stood still more immediately on the 'foundation rock': they were closer knit to the stem of the vine. They are the link with the past that enables one to say that Catholicity never died out *completely* in England since it was planted there. A few Catholics remained among a nation of schismatics and heretics. The national Church and all its bishops were schismatics; the persecuted laymen and missionary priests were Catholics, linked up with the rest of the Catholic Church throughout the world by that loyalty to the Pope which outlawed them in England. They fulfilled the test of St. Augustine, 'We are joined to the churches beyond the seas' (Ps. cont. Don.) In the words of Lord Macaulay: 'The reformed churches were mere national churches. The Church of England (after the Reformation) was for England alone' ('Essays,' viii). As a Western Church it was bound to be in communion with the Patriarch of the West, the Pope. As a part of the Catholic Church it was essential that it should be in subjection to the head of the whole Church Catholic, again—the Pope.

is not shared by those who are refused communion by all the rest of the world. It is no use being in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury, unless he can share with you the communion of the Bishops of the Catholic Church. And this right he lost when England broke with Rome. For five hundred years before the Reformation the English Church was out of communion with the East, for in those days it broke with all those that had broken with Rome. The pre-Reformation English Church denied Catholicity to the East from the time of the Schism. When, in its turn, it repudiated the jurisdiction of the Pope, it lost its own Catholicity as truly as the English Colonists lost their English nationality when America established its independence. Creeds, Sacraments, and Apostolic Succession no more confer Catholicity than do English ancestors, language, and customs confer English nationality on Americans to-day. A Visible Society has its Government as an essential part of its Constitution, and a rebel against the Government is expelled from the Church.

'The Church of England was a limb lopped off from the Catholic trunk; it was cut away from the stream by which its vascular system had been fed, and the life of it as an independent and corporate existence was gone for ever. But it had been taken up and grafted upon the State,' says the historian Froude ('History,' vii. p. 174).

The metaphor is inaccurate, and might mislead: there was not left that continuity of species which the 'grafting' implies.

The Catholic Church, as a fully organised Society, died in England, and another Society began to exist as truly as the American nation began to exist after the breach with England was completed.

Bishop Gore says: 'The most fundamental of all these scandals—the cause at bottom of all the others—

is that we should have been content, and should still be content, *in defiance of the intentions of Christ* and of the Spirit of the Church, to suffer the Church of England to lack the power of self-government' ('Religion of the Church,' p. 178).

Yes, Erastianism *is* a fundamental scandal and the cause of others, and the position of the English Church to-day *is* 'in defiance of the intentions of Christ.' As Bishop Gore says in the same chapter quoted above, 'The Christian Church can never be a pure Democracy, *for the Church is first of all a monarchy*, and the will of Christ, expressed through the dogmatic and disciplinary authority of the Church Catholic, is a law over every local and national Church.' But in Bishop Gore's theory, it is a visible society without a visible monarch. The *individual bishops* are monarchs in his Church theory, but there is no extension of the monarchical idea beyond the diocese.

In England the only hope of the spread of Catholic ideas, if this 'monarchical' idea is to be consistently applied, is to be found in a steady supply of bishops who hold and teach these Catholic truths. But such a supply is not guaranteed to the English Church, and since the breach with Rome no such guarantee was possible. Everything depends upon the views of the Prime Minister of the day, as it depended in Tudor days upon the will of the Sovereign. The VI Articles of Henry VIII were succeeded by the XXXIX Articles of Elizabeth, which contradicted their Catholic teaching; but the new principle of faith was the same for both. The civil authority is the last court of appeal on doctrinal matters in the Establishment. Every now and then a 'Gorham case' brings this home to Anglo-Catholics.

Of the Church's 'luck' in the matter of the selection of its bishops, the *Church Times* writes in a leader

(November 17, 1922), after the General Election: Mr. Lloyd George '*has rigidly banned all Catholics*; he has also given the cold-shoulder to the older-fashioned Evangelicals. He has aimed at making the Church safe for Modernism. . . . And matters are likely in the future to become worse than they are at present. . . . Even if accident gave us an Anglo-Catholic Premier, and in consequence Anglo-Catholic appointments, the System would still be one that no Catholic could defend.'

A Church which accepts the Episcopate as an *ecclesia docens*, and recognises that the laity are to be taught (*ecclesia discens*) by their bishops, could not survive in such conditions. But the Anglican Church, Dr. Gore tells us, does not emphasise this division of the Church into 'docens' and 'discens,' so perhaps Anglicanism could survive even a labour-communist 'Bishop maker' with characteristically atheistic views on religion.

The Chairman at a Caxton Hall protest meeting on the Cury Deprivation Case gave this reason for remaining an Anglican:

> There was no more difficult position to fill than that of a Catholic in the Church of England. If he (the speaker) were asked why he were not a Roman Catholic, his reply was that it was so extraordinarily difficult to be an Anglican—and the difficult thing was probably the right thing (*Church Times*, July 18, 1919).

To be a Catholic in the Church of England is not merely difficult, it is impossible. A man may be a Rationalist, or a Theosophist, or a Modernist, and he may keep his membership in the Church. He may be an Arian, and may still become an Anglican Bishop. He may disbelieve in Baptismal regeneration, and yet may be ordained to baptise. One thing he cannot be in the Anglican Church—he cannot be a *Catholic*.

And this, not because of any lack of comprehensiveness in the English Church, but because the essential mark of Catholicism is that it is founded on Peter, and is in submission to Peter's successor, the Pope.

Would that earnest Anglicans would ponder prayerfully and dispassionately the weighty words of Lord Halifax in his 'Call to Reunion':

> . . . If we see reasons to believe that in the working of God's Providence a visible centre of unity has been provided for the Church in order to secure the unity of God's Kingdom on earth, is it not our bounden duty to obey His will in all humility? Must we not, in candour, acknowledge that the course we have been pursuing for upwards of three hundred years has not been productive of religious unity even in England, and ought we not to ask ourselves seriously whether the results of that course are such as to encourage its continuance? (p. 16).

There is no hope of Corporate Reunion between the English Church and the Apostolic See. Meanwhile, individual Anglicans have their souls to save, and their own best judgment is the guide that they must follow till, helped by God's Grace, it leads them to a Church that teaches clearly, authoritatively, infallibly '*All* the things' whatsoever Christ had heard from the Father and commanded His Church to communicate to man. With the grace of Faith will come the Peace that He promises 'surpassing all understanding.' They will at last know the joy of hearing His voice: 'He that heareth you heareth Me.'

No longer will they be 'eavesdroppers' listening hungrily outside a closed door to the teaching which Holy Mother Church addresses to her own children. They have opened the door, and the arms of Mother Church are about them with love and joy and welcome, and all Her treasures are theirs, the certain possession

of Catholic Truth and valid Sacraments. At last they know themselves to be undeniably children of the household of God, lambs safe within the sheepfold of Christ, shepherded by the successors of Peter. 'Other sheep I have that are not of this fold,' said Christ. 'Them must I bring and they shall hear my voice'—echoing down the ages through Peter and the Popes. 'And there shall be one fold and one shepherd.' 'For you were as sheep going astray, but now you are converted to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls' (1 Pet. ii. 25).

Can we end these lectures better than with the closing words of Cardinal Newman's 'Essay on Development of Doctrine'? 'And now, dear Reader, Time is short, Eternity is long. Put not from you what you have here found; regard it not as a mere matter of present controversy; set not out resolved to refute it and looking about for the best way of doing so; seduce not yourself with the imagination that it comes of disappointment, or disgust, or restlessness, or wounded feeling, or undue sensibility or other weakness. Wrap not yourself round in the associations of years past; nor determine that to be truth which you wish to be so, nor make an idol of cherished anticipations. Time is short, Eternity is long.

Nunc dimittis servum Tuum Domine
Secundum verbum tuum in pace:
Quia viderunt oculi mei Salutare Tuum.'

APPENDIX

THE following books and pamphlets, dealing with the topics treated in these lectures, are strongly recommended by the author to his readers.

Aspects of Anglicanism, Canon Moyes. (Longmans, Green & Co.)

Bishops Gore and the Catholic Claims, Chapman, O.S.B. (Longmans.) 1*s.* 3*d.*

The Religion of the Plain Man, R. H. Benson. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne.) 4*s.*

Authority, Luke Rivington. Catholic Truth Society. 2*s.*

England's Breach with Rome, Cardinal Gasquet. C.T.S. 1*s.*

Catholic Belief, Bruno. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

The Threshold of the Catholic Church, Bagshawe. 1*s.* 6*d.*

The Petrine Office, Hall. C.T.S. 1*s.*

Anglican Claim to be Catholic, Mortimer. C.T.S. 6*d.*

The See of Peter, Allies. C.T.S. 2*s.*

A City set on a Hill, R. H. Benson. C.T.S. 6*d.*

The First Eight Councils and Papal Infallibility, Chapman, O.S.B. C.T.S. 6*d.*

C.T.S. Pamphlets, 2*d.* each.

Anglican Orders (Mortimer).

Some Prerogatives of Peter (Carson).

A Talk on Continuity (Moyes).

Date of the Anglican Schism (Fortescue).

Infallibility and Tradition (Benson).

Papal Infallibility (McIntyre).

Continuity reconsidered (Matthews).

The Lambeth Conference.

Can I stay where I am? (Horne).

The Branch Theory. (Fortescue).

Authority and Private Judgment (H. E. Hall).

Have Anglicans a right to call themselves Catholics? (Mortimer).

Also: *Catholicism the True Rationalism*, F. Woodlock, S.J. 2*s.* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne.) 1*s.*

The Miracles at Lourdes, C.T.S. 2*d.* F. Woodlock, S.J.

These books can be obtained at the Depot and Reading Room of the *Catholic Truth Society, 72 Victoria Street, S.W.* 1.

INDEX

Acton, Lord, 4
Alcuin, 78
Ambrose, St., 78
Anastasius, 26
Anselm, St., 76
Athanasius, St., 24
Augustine, St., 76

Basil, St., 24
Beza, 44
Birmingham, Bishop of, 42
Bolotov, 23
Brownson, 36

Calvin, 44
Chapman, O.S.B., 21
Chrysostom, St. J., 21
Church Times, 1, 3, 20, 35, 41, 70, 80, 84
Clement, St., 25
Cranmer, 59, 61
Cyprian, St., 60, 78
Cyril of Alexandria, 30

d'Herbigny, 23, 50

Exeter, Synod of, 79

Farrar, Dean, 37
Fortescue, 20, 69
Froude, 82

Gloucester, Bishop of, 42

Halifax, Lord, 2, 19, 85
Hooker, 66
Hormisdas, Pope, 26

Inge, Dean, 86
Irenæus, 25, 78

Jerome, St., 79, 80

Lightfoot, Bishop, 25

McNabb, O.P., 52
Macaulay, Lord, 43
Major, 40
Mallock, W. H., 44
Martin, St., 29
Mercier, Cardinal, 47
Methodius, St., 32
Modernists, 39

Newman, Cardinal, 37, 86

Paul, St., 10

Rubric, black, 64
Rust, Canon, 60

Sanday, Dr., 36
Sorley, Prof., 39
Sylvester, St., 29

Theodoret, 24

Printed in England at THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
Colchester, London & Eton

DATE DUE

230
G66

BX 1765 .G58 W6 1923

Woodlock, Francis, 1871-

Constantinople, Canterbury &
Rome

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BX1765.G58 W6 1923
Woodlock, Fra Constantinople, Canterbury
3 0645 0004 7613 1